PART CCXXVIII. (VOL. XVIII.) DECEMBER, 1889.

THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY,

A JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

IN

ARCHÆOLOGY, EPIGRAPHY, ETHNOLOGY, GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY, FOLKLORE, LANGUAGES, LITERATURE, NUMISMATICS, PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION, &c. &c.

Edited by

JOHN FAITHFULL FLEET, C.I.E.,
BOMBAY CIVIL SERVICE,

AND

RICHARD CARNAC TEMPLE,
CAPTAIN, BENGAL STAFF CORPS.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

1. A SELECTION OF KANARESE BALLADS, No. 4. THE CRIME AND DEATH OF SANGYA, by J. F. FLEET, Bo.C.S., M.R.A.S., C.I.E. 353
2. KOMARALINGAM COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF RAVIDATTA, by J. F. FLEET, Bo.C.S., M.R.A.S., C.I.E. 362
3. WEBER'S SACRED LITERATURE OF THE JAINS, Translated by DR. H. W. SMYTH 369

PAGE

MISCELLANEA :—

4. GUSTAVE GARREZ, by G. A. G. 378
5. HINDU DATES, No. 31, TALGUND INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF JAYASIMHA III., by J. F. FLEET ... 379
6. THE SIXTY-YEAR CYCLE OF JUPITER, by F. KIELHORN 380

Plates :—

Komaralingam Plates of Ravidatta ..... to face p. 368.
A Plate of Music, to face p. 354, will be issued with the Index Part.

Part CCXXIX. containing the remainder of the December Part and the Index, &c., will be issued shortly.

BOMBAY :

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED AT THE EDUCATION SOCIETY'S PRESS, BYCULLA.

LONDON : TRÜBNER & Co. PARIS : E. LEROUX. BERLIN : A. ASHER & Co. NEW YORK : WESTERMANN & Co.

BOMBAY : EDUCATION SOCIETY'S PRESS.

1889.

[All Rights Reserved.]

Annual Subscription in advance, Rs. 20, or, including Postage, 36s., via Brindisi.

Subscribers are in **arrears** for Vols. I. to XIII. to the total amount of **Rs. 401.** It is specially requested that these out standings may be cleared off without further delay.

N.B.—Subscriptions for the year 1886 (Vol. XV.) are **overdue** to the amount of **Rs. 240,** for **1887, Rs. 116,** and for **1888, Rs. 163.**

Subscribers in Europe are requested to pay their Subscriptions for 1888 to the Joint Proprietors' account, Chartered Mercantile Bank, 65, Old Broad St., London, E.C., giving notice of their having done so, and of **Address,** by card addressed to the Manager, Education Society's Press, Bombay. This arrangement will secure such Subscribers their copies being posted direct.

Contributors of Articles to this Journal will greatly oblige the Editors if they will leave the **upper half of the first sheet of manuscript blank,** for the convenience of the Editors in entering instructions to the Press regarding titling, style of printing, submission of proofs, &c. &c. Such instructions, when sent separately, are liable to result in confusion and delay.

Papers and correspondence for the Journal from contributors should be addressed to the EDITORS, care of the Education Society's Press, Bombay.

Remittances, correspondence relative to Subscriptions, and notices of change of address to be sent to—

The Superintendent,
Education Society's Press,
Bombay.

Notes and Queries will always be gladly received and inserted in the *Indian Antiquary.*

REQUEST.—Dr. F. Knauer, Professor in the University of Kief who is preparing an edition of the **Mânava-Brauta-Sûtra** and the **Mânava-Grihya-Sûtra,** asks the owners of Manuscripts (text and commentaries) to kindly lend him the same for use. The India Office Library will forward the MSS., which will be safely and promptly returned.

Published Monthly, Price 8 annas.

THE INDIAN TRAVELLER'S GUIDE, containing the Special Time and Fare Tables of all the Indian Railway Companies, Steam Boat and Dâk Companies, Bullock Trains and Transit Companies; the Routes between the principal towns of Northern, Central, and Western India, &c.

With a Coloured Map of India.

Bombay:

Printed and Published at the "Bombay Gazette" Steam Press.

Agents: *Bombay,* Watson & Co., Thacker & Co.; *Poona,* Treacher & Co., B. Phillips; *Deolalee,* Cursetjee Dossabhoy; *Calcutta,* Wyman & Co.; *Madras,* Higginbotham & Co.; *Allahabad,* Kellner & Co. (Railway Station); *London,* G. Street, 30, Cornhill; Gordon and Gotch, St. Bride Street, Ludgate Circus, E.C.

ERRATA.

p. 267, note 22, for *satru-mardanah,* read *śakti-sampannah.*

p. 269, l. 10, *for* four-toothed, *read* four-tusked.

" , l. 30, *for* who destroys his foes &c., *read* who is endowed with bravery and energy and the (*royal*) powers.

p. 270, l. 14, *for* Parâsara *read* Parâśara; *and at the end of the line insert* ", *to mark the end of the donor's speech.*

On the cover of the November Part, for Part CCXXXVII., *read* Part CCXXVII.

PAPERS IN THE JANUARY AND FEBRUARY NUMBERS OF VOL. XIX., 1890:—

The Epoch of the Lakshmanasena Era. By F. Kielhorn.

Mahakuta Pillar Inscription of Mangalesa. By J. F. Fleet.

Examination of Questions connected with the Vikrama Era. By F. Kielhorn.

The Original Surya-Siddhanta. By Sh. B. Dikshit.

Kanaswa Inscription of Sivagana; the Malava year 795 expired. By F. Kielhorn.

Weber's Sacred Literature of the Jains; continuation. By H. W. Smyth.

OTHER PAPERS ON HAND FOR VOL. XIX:—

Inscriptions of Piyadasi; the Dhauli and Jaugada Edicts. By E. Senart and G. A. Grierson.

Rare Copper Coins of Akbar. By Chas. J. Rodgers.

Weber's Sacred Literature of the Jains; continuation. By H. W. Smyth.

Buddhaghosha. By Thos. Foulkes.

Examination of Questions connected with the Vikrama Era; first continuation. By F. Kielhorn.

Texts of Asoka Edicts on the Dehli Mirat Pillar and of the Separate Edicts on the Allahabad Pillar. By G. Bühler.

An Inscription in a Buddhistic variety of Nail-headed Characters. By C. Bendall.

Balagamve Stone Inscription of the time of Vinayaditya. By J. F. Fleet.

Sorab Copper-Plate Grant of Vinayaditya; Saka-Samvat 614 expired. By J. F. Fleet.

The Romaka Siddhantas. By Sh. B. Dikshit.

Examination of some Errors in Warren's Kalasankalita. By Sh. B. Dikshit.

Delhi Siwalik Pillar Inscriptions of Visaladeva; the Vikrama year 1220. By F. Kielhorn.

The Aborigines of Sokotra. By J. S. King.

Notice of the Golabnama. By E. Rehatsek.

Folklore in Southern India—
No. 32.—The Four Good Maxims; Second Variant. By S. M. Natesa Sastri.
" 33.—The Six Good Maxims. By S. M. Natesa Sastri.
" 34.—The Shower of Gold and Scorpions. By S. M. Natesa Sastri.

Folklore in Western India—
No. 15.—The Wonderful Tree. By Putlibai D. H. Wadia.

Mantur Inscription of the time of Jayasimha III.; Saka-Samvat 962. By J. F. Fleet.

Some Gold Coins of the Eastern Chalukya kings Saktivarman and Rajaraja II. By J. F. Fleet.

Three Ujjain Copper-Plate Grants of the Rulers of Malava. By F. Kielhorn.

Extracts from the Rajataramgini, No. 3; the Second Taramga. By E. Hultzsch.

A SELECTION OF KANARESE BALLADS.

BY J. F. FLEET, BO.C.S., M.R.A.S., C.I.E.

(*Continued from Vol.* XVI. *p.* 361.)

No. 4. — THE CRIME AND DEATH OF SANGYA.

THIS ballad, a very favourite one in the Belgaum District, owes its popularity to the pointed way in which it comes home to many a poor cultivator, who, situated as Saṅgya was, would very heartily endorse the sentiment (at the end of verse 8) that "very strict are the English laws; no one can play any tricks under them."

The action is based on a murder, which took place on the 13th October, A. D. 1863 (see notes 16, 32, below), at Hoṅgal, or, as the town is more usually called, Bail-Hoṅgal or "Hoṅgal of the open country." The victim was a money-lender named Basaliṅgaṇṇa, whose business and personal habits are described in the opening verse. Among his debtors was a cultivator named Saṅga, Saṅgya, or Saṅgaṇṇa, who, in the usual manner, had pledged his field as security for the advances made to him. At length the creditor, who, as the song says, "took care to shew no harshness beyond what the law allows," sues Saṅgya in the Subordinate Judge's Court at Saundatti, and obtains a decree against him. Saṅgya appeals to the District Judge at Dhârwâḍ; but without success. And then in due course a clerk of the court is sent to execute the decree, by selling the field by auction; and, Saṅgya being unable to buy it in, and failing to obtain any further respite from his creditor, the field is made over into the money-lender's possession. Then Saṅgya, taking counsel with his brother Parsya, determines to have his revenge by killing Basaliṅgaṇṇa. Rising at dawn next day, Saṅgya prostrates himself at his mother's feet; and then he and Parsya, after a prayer for success to their patron-god Basavaṇṇa, set out. They think first of killing Phakiraṇṇa, one of Basaliṅgaṇṇa's brothers, but cannot find him; for, "Paramêśvara (the supreme god) protected him," and he had fortunately left his house. Again they do worship to Basavaṇṇa, and then decide upon killing Basaliṅgaṇṇa's other brother, Râchappa; but him, again, they fail to meet with, since, happily for him, "the protector is more powerful than the slayer, and very fortunate was his luck." Then they go straight to Basaliṅgaṇṇa's house, and find him there, engaged in business; "his thoughts being only on his rupees." And without any more ado, heedless of the spectators, Saṅgya pulls out his sickle from where it is hidden up his sleeve, and cuts him down; "the blood poured out in torrents from his mouth; his senses failed; he fell and died." No particular attempt at escape is made; in fact, Saṅgya's remorse allows him not to try; and straightway he and Parsya are seized and taken to the village police-station. Two very characteristic touches are introduced here; the binding of Saṅgya and Parsya face to face to a post, where they are beaten till they confess; and their attempt to implicate an innocent man, Hûvina-Râma, to gratify some private spite against him. The Chief Constable then comes to investigate the matter; and the prisoners are taken on to the Mâmlatdâr at Sampgaum. From there they are forwarded to Belgaum, to stand their trial. And at length, Hûvina-Râma is duly acquitted; Parsya is let off with transportation for life; and Saṅgya is sentenced to death. Saṅgya is first taken to the jail at Dhârwâḍ, which then was the principal jail for the two Districts. But, in accordance with a frequent custom in the case of exceptional murders such as the present one, it was decided to carry out the sentence at the village of Hoṅgal itself. And the rest of the ballad is occupied with the journey, with Saṅgya's farewell to his parents, with his lamentation over his untimely fate, and with the description of the execution. Here there are many touching passages; and the whole account is extremely graphic.

A short addition at the end shews that this ballad was composed by a professional ballad-monger named Appu, a Marâṭhâ; and that the great merit of it obtained at once for his party the victory in a contest of singing with some rivals of the same profession.

TRANSLATION.

Chorus.

A very bad thing is poverty! The poor man felt much wrath! When he had to pay his debt to the money-lender, great distress came upon Saṅgya!

First Verse.

In the city of Hoṅgal there is a money-lender; Dûravajanti is his name.[1] In silver and gold, small change and silver currency, and cotton, are his dealings and trade. The silversmiths receive his money, for making various kinds of *chaukas*[2] of pure Chinese silver; and every week, on Saturday, the running accounts of the *chaukas* are made up. Of manifold kinds are his functions; and eight or ten are his servants. Innumerable women clear his cotton from the seed, in both the winter and the rainy season.

(With a change of metre),[3] — How shall I describe his business? He carried on all the duties of a money-changer. His two brothers, elder and younger,[4] (*assisted him with*) great intelligence; in what they did, there was no lack of gain; no one in the village felt any dislike (*for them*); with great honesty they carried on the business of a money-lender.

(Lowering the voice), — I will describe to you his apparel; listen now! He used to stroll along the streets, wearing a very fine *chauka*[5] fastened round his neck; and on his head a turban with a border worked with gold threads; look at him! His upper-cloth was from Nâgpur;[6] on his body there was a separate jacket of camlet;[7] how beautiful were his *chandrahâra* and *gôpa*,[8] with the gold glittering so lustrously upon his breast; on his finger he wore a pure and holy ring.[9]

(Raising the voice), — In speech he was very firm; not the least particle of falsehood (*was in him*)!

Second Verse.

Listen first to the origin of the matter. See!; the field in (Saṅgya's) occupancy was good black soil. He (*mortgaged it for a loan, and*) executed a deed in due form, with a period of five years; last year they went to law; (*the lender*) shewed no harshness beyond what the law allows; according to (*the value of*) the produce, he laid his plaint; and the quarrel came up (*for trial*) in the Saundatti Court. (*Saṅgya*) presented the stamped paper (*containing his plea*), admitting that Basaliṅgaṇṇa's words were true, and did obeisance. The Munsiff[10] (*pronounced against him, and*) said, — "Go to Dhârwâḍ, and make your petition of appeal."

(With a change of metre), — From there he came to Hoṅgal, and made, Sir, preparation for the journey. Taking with him a hundred rupees, he set out thence for Dhârwâḍ. He presented to the Government[11] the petition of appeal, and straightway retained a Vakîl.[12]

---

[1] This must be his surname. The word has also been explained to me as meaning that his name was known "far and wide." But I cannot find any authority for this.

[2] A *chauka* is a box in which a *liṅga*, the phallic emblem, is carried; it is usually worn suspended from the neck.

[3] *chyê* stands for *chyâla*, = *châla*; see *ante*, Vol. XV. p. 350, note 6.

[4] The Râchappa and Phakiraṇṇa who are mentioned further on.

[5] *śikhâmaṇi* seems to be used here to qualify *chauka*, and to denote 'a *chauka*, the best of its kind; a very excellent *chauka*.'

[6] This is the Nâgpur of the Central Provinces, which has long had a great reputation for the manufacture of *dhôtars*, or the cloths worn by men. Two such cloths are worn; one fastened round the waist, and hanging down; and the other round the upper part of the body. Here the verbal adjective *hott-iru*, i.e. *hott-iruva*, specifies the upper cloth. The lower cloth is called *uṭṭa-konda dhôtra*.

[7] The word in the text, *kemalaṭa*, is an adaptation of the English word. I am told that camlet stuff was formerly much used in this part of the country.

[8] These are gold necklets of different patterns.

[9] The third finger of the right hand is called *pavitrada beraḷu*, 'the pure finger,' as being considered purer than the others; and *pavitrada uṅgara* is the technical name of a ring, made of gold, for this finger.

[10] The Native judge of the local court. The official title now is 'Subordinate Judge.'

[11] i.e. to the Court of the District Judge.

[12] A Native lawyer, a 'Pleader.'

(Lowering the voice), — "Present now a petition for me," he said; "take these hundred rupees, of the Government currency;[13] tell me quickly what you say to me." The Vakîl took thought in his mind, see now!, and gave a promise to devote his energies to the case, and said, — "Why do you feel anxiety (*about the result*), since you have given your Vakîl a hundred rupees, into his very hand?" The first day of the month was Sunday; and the date (*of hearing the appeal was fixed for*) the next day, Monday; and straightway there was issued an order of attachment.

(Raising the voice), — The Kârkûn[14] brought and executed the order of attachment. Thus Basaliṅga carried into effect his pertinacious design!

Third Verse.

The Kârkûn says, — "Call Saṅgya and tell him, 'a decree has been passed against you for (*the value of*) the produce, reckoned at three hundred rupees: how much do you bid (*to retain it in your own possession*)'?" A great web (*of trouble*) was cast round Saṅgya. He explained what was convenient to himself, saying — "I will pay the money according to the decree; set free my share in the field; the whole fault is truly mine; apart from you I have no refuge; I will never disobey the orders of Basaliṅgaṇṇa." Thus saying, he joined his hands in supplication and embraced his feet.

(With a change of metre), — "Since the order of attachment has come, what can I say?; to-day your field is lost." Thus Basaliṅgaṇṇa hardened his heart; and the field passed into the possession of (*his brother*) Phakiraṇṇa. Going home, Saṅgya pondered, — "To-day my field, belonging to me by right of occupancy, has been lost."

(Lowering the voice), — Saṅga and Parsya, the two together, made another plan, see!, a secret device, conversing with laughter, — "The speech between me and you, let it be known to no one; without letting anyone know, let us do that which we can; we will rise in the early morning and go (*to do it*)." They sharpened their sickles, as they sat, saying, — "We will kill him, even though to-day we lose our heads; let that happen which must; except life, (*nothing is left to us*)."

(Raising the voice), — Basaliṅga left the village of Wakkund; on the morrow the festival of the *Mahânavamî*[15] was to be celebrated!

Fourth Verse.

On the Tuesday,[16] at dawn, he (Saṅgya) rose of his own accord, and went and fell at the feet of his mother. Then Saṅgya and Parsya said, — "O (god) Basavaṇṇa, carry through our quarrel to its accomplishment!" Sharpening his sickle, and concealing it under his arm-pit, he set out, and at the third hour of the day he came to Phakiraṇṇa's house. At his house they ask, — "Where has he gone?; we had much business with him." Says Tukkaṇṇa, — "Why hast thou come?; what business hast thou with me?"

(With a change of metre), — Hearing this, he went back again, and searched in the field and on the stream. Had he been found, his life was lost; but Paramêśvara (Śiva) protected Phakiraṇṇa! Having searched everywhere, he came to a shop, and bought some camphor and a cocoanut.

(Lowering the voice), — Quickly he went to the god Basavaṇṇa, and broke the cocoanut, and ignited the camphor and waved it (*round the head of the god*), and did reverence, and then

---

[13] *lit.* "rupees (which have on them) the face (of the Sovereign), (and which are) of a regular round shape." The intention is to distinguish them from the so-called Sûrti rupees, of very different make, which at the time of this ballad had not yet entirely ceased to be current.

[14] One of the clerks of the Court.

[15] *lit.* "the pot of the *Mahânavamî* was to be placed." The *Mahânavamî*, which is better known in other parts of India as the *Durgâpûjâ*, is a festival in honour of the goddess Durgâ, commencing on the first *tithi* of the bright fortnight of the month Âśvina. On that day water-pots, filled with water, are placed near the gods, who are supposed to reside in them till the *navamî* or ninth *tithi*.

[16] The 13th October, A.D. 1863; see further on.

took the road to Hoṅgal. Saṅganṇa went on in front, and then (*came*) Mêguṭi-Parsya, who said, — "First let us seize Râchappa and kill him." Talking thus together in various ways, they went to Râchappa's house, and asked the old house-wife, — "Where has Aṇṇappa[17] gone?"

(Raising the voice), — The protector is more powerful than the slayer; very fortunate was his (Râchappa's) luck!

Fifth Verse.

Say they, — "Our coming has been in vain;" they became wrathful in their minds. They went to Basaliṅgaṇṇa's house; their secret intention was not known. At the ninth hour (*i.e.* 3·0 p. m.), that which was predestined came to pass. Saṅgya and Parsya saluted, and went and stood close by him. Basalingaṇṇa's thoughts were on his rupees; near him there stood three or four men; he knew not that they would slay him; but Śiva brought the (*fatal*) wreath and fastened it (*round his neck*).[18]

(With a change of metre), — Pulling up the sleeve of his jacket from over his wrist, Saṅgya took out the sickle from under his armpit, and, taking aim as he stood there, cut him fiercely down. In the same way he drew out the sickle, and, having wounded him, slunk round behind him, and, calling Parsya, ran away.

(Lowering the voice), — In great agony Basaliṅgaṇṇa rose, bowing his head; the blood poured out in torrents from his mouth; his senses failed; he fell and died. The people sitting there went out in great confusion; they all said, — "Seize him! seize him! there he runs; he cut right through the neck." Those who met him, face to face, and close, not one of them seized him. Then, hearing the tidings, the Haḷabs[19] came.

(Raising the voice), — Throughout the village there was a great outcry; he could not pass beyond the gate[20] of Hoṅgal.

Sixth Verse.

Then ceased the anger of his mind. Quickly a crowd assembled. Hurling away the sickle from his hand, he threw it down. His (*sense of*) sin allowed to go no further. (*In*) a strait road, a narrow lane, quickly the Haḷabs seized him, and, cuffing and beating him, dragged him to the *chaudi*;[21] no respect was left, to be shewn to Saṅgya. The Kulkarṇî[22] came and looked. The Police Pâṭîl[23] said, —"Beat them!" Face to face tightly they bound Saṅgya and Parsya to a post.

(With a change of metre), — "Beat us not without necessity; now and here we confess that we killed him; arrest us, and send us to Sampgaum." An enquiry was made in the Kachêri.[24] They said, — "Hûvina-Râma was in the business with us; he is at the village of Wakkund; he is there."

(Lowering the voice), — The Haḷabs got ready and went to the village of Wakkund; there he was found, Hûvina-Râma. He became confused, and was in terror for his life; "they accuse me through enmity," (*he cried*); in fear, he staggered about, in an agitated manner; saying, — "What is this that has happened?," he wept. All the people in the village told him to be brave; "if you were not in this crime, nothing can happen," say his friends.

(Raising the voice), — In the dead of night he set out; they would not let him eat even a morsel.

---

[17] *i.e.* Râchappa. The word *aṇṇappa* is a respectful form of *aṇṇa*, 'an elder brother.'

[18] This is the meaning of the passage; but I have not been able to obtain an explanation of this allusion.

[19] *haḷaba*, 'one of the ancients, an old servant, an old inhabitant,' is one of the Kanarese names, the other being *wâlikâra*, for the village police or watchmen. They are employed on all miscellaneous revenue and police duties.

[20] The original has the words *gêṭa*, which is the English 'gate.' It may mean either 'the village gate,' or 'the Police-Station.'

[21] The office of the Pâṭîl and Kulkarṇî, where all the business of a village is transacted.

[22] The village accountant; the Pâṭîl's right-hand man and assistant.

[23] The Pâṭîl is the head man of a village. In the larger villages, as in the present case, there are separate Pâṭîls for the police and revenue duties. The *pôlisa* of the text is the English word 'police;' the word in composition with it, is the Kanarese *gauḍa*, which is the equivalent of the Marâṭhî *pâṭîl*. The Revenue Pâṭîl is called *mulkî-pâṭîl* or *mulkî-yauda*.

[24] *i.e.* in the Mâmlatdâr's office at Sampgaum, the chief town of the Tâlukâ or Sub-Division.

Seventh Verse.

The Police Pâṭîl and the Kulkarṇî said (*to the guard*), — "Be very watchful; they have killed a most respectable rich man; never before has such a thing happened." They made a report,[25] writing it on paper; a Haḷab took it, and went to Sampgaum. He delivered the report in the Kachêri; the Subhêdâr[26] read and examined it. Very speedily the Phaujdâr[27] got ready, and said, — "Put quickly the saddle on my horse." Taking a Peon,[28] on Wednesday, in the evening, he arrived.

(With a change of metre), — The Phaujdâr came, and stood and looked: with his own eyes he saw the blood; looking at the corpse, he grieved in sympathy. "Why were the gods Hari and Brahman wroth with him," (*he said*); "when they killed him, who were there?" (*The answer was*), — "Three people; (*two*) Liṅgâyat priests of Maṇṭûr, and Pañchappa."

(Lowering the voice), — Hearing this much, he told them to bury him. In great affliction the mother and father (*of Basaliṅgaṇṇa*) are weeping, falling flat on their faces, and rolling about in grief, crying, — "Evil is our luck; through his kindness there was nothing wanting in our happiness; (*when he was born*), what was the (*evil*) boon that he got from Śiva,[29] that our son has now left us and gone?; great is the grief of his wife; she has torn off and thrown away her marriage-thread, decorated with jewelled beads;[30] what now remains for us, since he is hidden in the earth?"

(Raising the voice), — O Vaikuṇṭha (Vishṇu)! an untimely death was his; who can understand the pranks of Śiva?

Eighth Verse.

"The day of the *Mahânavamî* new-moon[31] was Monday; the first day of the bright fortnight of Âśvayuja is Tuesday; it is the Saka year seventeen hundred and eighty-five, and the *saṁvatsara* named Rudhirôdgârin';[32] thus they reckoned it up, — the Police Pâṭîl, the Kulkarṇî, and the Phaujdâr. With Saṅgya and Parsya in close custody, the Haḷabs set out. "Be very much on the alert in this matter; attend at the Kachêri; if you fail to be on your guard, no one knows what may become of you;" — thus the Mâmlatdâr gave the order.

(With a change of metre), — They left this Tâlukâ, Sampgaum, and carried them to the District town of Belgaum. The gentleman[33] called for them, and made the adjudication. To Saṅgya, it was as if he had fallen into a tank or a well. They wrote the proceedings, and sent them to Bombay;[34] (*and reported that*) the bringing of Hûvina-Râma (*into the matter*) was unjust.

(Lowering the voice), — After three months the answer came; the noble officer read and examined it; "let Parsya off with transportation,[35] this is enough." As to the principal prisoner, Saṅgaṇṇa, the settlement was thus; the gentleman said, — "Go to Dhârwâḍ; it is

---

[25] The word in the original here, and a little further on, is *rapôrṭa*, which is an adaptation of the English word.

[26] The Mâmlatdâr; the head revenue and magisterial officer of the Tâlukâ.

[27] The 'Chief-Constable' of the Tâlukâ.

[28] *billi-manushya*, *lit.* 'a man who wears a brass badge on a belt slung over his shoulder or worn round his waist.' The more usual term is *paṭṭêwâlâ*, from the Hindustânî *paṭṭâ*, which denotes the same belt with its badge. The word *billi* is an adaptation from the English, and is, I imagine, the word 'bill.' But it is supposed by the Natives to be an adaptation of 'buckle,' which is often used for the same badge.

[29] Here, again, I cannot get an explanation of the allusion.

[30] The *guḷadâḷi* is a more elaborate kind of *tâḷi*, 'the marriage-badge worn by married women round the neck,' which is removed when a wife becomes a widow.

[31] *Mahânavamî-amâvâsyâ* is the popular name, in the Kanarese country, for the new-moon of Bhâdrapada, which immediately precedes Âśvina śukla 1. The present new-moon *tithi* ended on Monday, 12th October, A.D. 1863.

[32] The Rudhirodgârin *saṁvatsara* coincided with Śaka-Saṁvat 1785 as an expired year. And the corresponding English date for the details given in the text, is, Tuesday, 13th October, A.D. 1863, on which day the *tithi* Âśvina śukla 1 ended.

[33] *i.e.* the Sessions Judge.

[34] *i.e.* in order to obtain confirmation of the death-sentence. It would seem that, in the Sessions Court, Parsya, as well as Saṅgya, was sentenced to death; but that in his case the High Court commuted the sentence into one of transportation.

[35] *kari-nîrâ*, *lit.* 'the black water.' This is the popular term for transportation, because it entails crossing the sea, to the Andaman islands. The Marâṭhî expression *kâḷâ-pâṇî* has exactly the same meaning.

notified that the sentence is (*that he is to be hanged*) by the neck." A guard of soldiers on him, all around, took him to Dhârwâḍ; not any device (*for saving himself*) suggested itself to him after that.

(Raising the voice), — Very strict are the English laws; no one can play any tricks!

Ninth Verse.

He left the village of Dhârwâḍ, and came away; no one could save him. "Take him, and go to Hoṅgal," said the gentleman, the Subhêdâr, the Phaujdâr, and the Kârkûn; "be wide awake, with great watchfulness." In front of him and behind, there was an escort with drawn swords; there was all the apparatus for hanging him; and Saṅgya was seated on a cart. They brought him in close restraint.[36] He converses without any fear. On the Thursday he sent for his elder and younger brothers, and his mother.

(With a change of metre), — To the mother that bare him, he says, — "Why dost thou weep? all that which was to happen, has occurred; it has befallen me as it did to Abhimanyu in the battle-field; for me from no one was there any aid;[37] to-day the debt is paid; cease now to grieve for me."

(Lowering the voice), — Saying this, he made the funeral lament, for just a little while, — "That my fate has been settled thus, (*is the decree of*) an unjust court; they inquired not into my fault; I thought that they would let me go free, with imprisonment for only a year; I have been caught and captured; my fault has been in accordance with that which (the god) Brahman wrote;[38] my fate (*is like that of*) a lamp that has gone out unintentionally while still there is oil left; (*to nourish*) enmity is very evil; anger should not be felt."

(Raising the voice), — Disputing at every word is bad; to a good man, a (*mere*) word is a blow!

Tenth Verse.

The market-day was Friday;[39] that same day the people of the neighbourhood gathered together. He talks with catching breath, and is beside himself. They brought him outside the village. Joining his hands in respectful salutation, he made a little request to the gentleman,[40] — "Spend five rupees, and have me buried in a *maṭha*."[41] His face shrivelled and grew small; his colour lost its lustre, and faded away. Saying "Hara! Hara!", he took his way (*to the gallows*), and, mounting, stood on the appointed place.

(With a change of metre), — They fastened the rope around his neck, right round his throat; he trod the path of heaven to Kailâsa.[42] His elder and younger sisters, his elder and younger brothers, and his mother, (*made*) lament; the people were standing all around. Four months and twelve days (*had elapsed since*) the date of the *Awarâtri* new-moon.[43]

(Lowering the voice), — The village of Bail-Hoṅgal is a great city, this is well known; it is famed far and wide in the surrounding kingdom. (*There there is*) the god Hanumanta, to whom be reverence! Tukârâm is our teacher; the ballad-monger Appu has composed (*this song*); the hand-writing, in which there is no fault, is that of Dêmaṇṇa, on whose drum there is

---

[36] *lit.* "confined in a net."

[37] The more literal meaning is "no one was my charioteer." I have not a book to refer to; but it seems that Abhimanyu was killed in single fight, hemmed in by the Kauravas, with none of his own party near at hand to help him.

[38] Brahman is supposed to write on a man's forehead all that he is destined to do during his life.

[39] We are told further on that this day was four months and twelve days after the new-moon of Pausha. This latter *tithi* ended on Sunday, 7th February, A.D. 1864. And so we seem to have either Friday, 19th June, or Friday, 26th June, for the day of the execution.

[40] i.e. the Magistrate, or the District Superintendent of Police, who attended the execution.

[41] Compare *ante*, Vol. XIV. p. 300, where the amount is ten rupees. A *maṭha* is a kind of religious college, or residence of priests.

[42] The mountain Kailâsa, supposed to be one of the loftiest peaks in the Himâlayas, is the paradise of Śiva. The term *Kailâsa-vâsin*, 'now residing in Kailâsa,' is of constant occurrence in speaking of deceased persons.

[43] *Awarâtri-amâvâsyâ* is the popular name, in the Kanarese country, of the new-moon day of Pausha. I have been told that it is a corruption of *avatâra-râtri*; but I do not see how it can be connected with any of the *avatâras*. A more probable explanation is that it stands for *avare-râtri*, 'the night on which people can begin to eat the *avare*-bean after its harvest.'

a plume of pearls, with feathers and tinsel, and gold and silver lace. Santu and Basaṇṇa, our firm friends, have completely overcome our enemies;[44] defeat has come[45] to the *kalagi*.

(Raising the voice), — Mâdhavarao became a sore trouble to the *kalagi*; in singing he has everything at the tip of his tongue.

TEXT.

Pallâ.

Baḍatana ambudu baḷa-keṭṭa baḍavaga banto bahu śiṭṭa |
sâwakâra sâlâ koḍa-bêk-âdara Saṅgyâga âdito saṅkashṭa || Pallâ ||

1ne nuḍi.

Sahar Hoṅgaladâga sâwakâra | Dûravajanti avana hesara | beḷḷi baṅgâra rokka rupâyi aḷḷiya wahiwaṭa vyâpâra | Chinâya kurêda chauka-tara | rupâyi wôyuttâra pattâra | wâra-wâra chalati chauka-lekkha mâḍodu Saniwâra | andâdundi avana kârbhâra | hatt-eṇṭu mandi avana manushyara | mâgi maḷigâla hatti arawutâra gotta illada hoṅgasara || Chyê || Yena hêḷal=evana[46] kârbâraki | ava mâḍut-iddano chinawâraki | aṇṇa-tammar=ibbaru tiḷavaḷiki | avara mâḍudaka kaḍim=illa gaḷiki | ûrâga yârigâg=illa bêsariki | bahaḷa sâche iṭṭadda sâwakâriki || Iḷava || Avana pôshâka hêḷatena nimaga | kêḷa îga | ava hiḍada teragat-idda wôṇi | chauka-śikhâmaṇi | hâkidda koraḷâga | jerakâṭi rumâla tali-mêga | nôḍa avaga | hott-iru dôtra Nâkpuri | kemalaṭa bêre | aṅgi maiyâga | chandrabâra gôpa chanda hyâṅga | yedi-mêga | taḷataḷa hoḷudu baṅgâra | pavitrad=uṅgarâ | iṭṭidda beraḷâga || Yêra || Mâtili iddana bahu-diṭṭa | suḷḷu mâta illa yaḷḷ-ashṭa || 1 ||

2ne nuḍi.

Modala kêḷa mâtina jari | khâteda hola nôḍa jâta yeri | aida varashada dina muddata mâḍidana bara-koṭṭa kâgada barâbari | nyâya bandito hôda-bari | jôri mâḍalilla kâyade mîri | mâsîli-prakâra phiryâdi mâḍidana Sawadatti-kôrṭinyâga bitta muri | Basaliṅgaṇṇana mâta sari | shṭâpa chelli mâḍida mujari | Munsupha antana aphil-arji Dhârwâḍake hôgi mâḍari || Chyê || Allinda bandana Hoṅgalaka | masalatta mâḍida hogudak=ari | nûra rupâyi togoṇḍa hantêka | illinda hoṇṭana Dhârwâḍaka | aphil-arji koṭṭana sarakâraka | vakilau=iṭṭano âgina-kshaṇaka || Iḷava || Arji anta mâḍi koḍa namaga nî îga | nûra rupâyi togo mâri gâḍi | hêḷa lagu mâḍi | yên=anti namaga | vakîla tiḷada manadâga | nôḍa âga | hîng=anta koṭṭa wachana | kaṭlêda sandana | chinti yâko ninaga | nûra rupâyi koṭṭa vakîlage | kaiyâga | pahilâ târîkha muddata Âdityawâra | munda Sômawâra | jabati banta bêga || Yêra || Kârkûna tanda jabati iṭṭa | Basaliṅga naḍisida tanna haṭa || 2 ||

3ne nuḍi.

Munnûra rupâyida mâsîlâ | nina mêl=âyito phaisalâ | kârkûna antana Saṅgenna karasu nî yêna mâḍati sawâlâ | Saṅgyâga bitto maha-jâlâ | hêḷi-koṇḍa tana anakûlâ | phaisala-prakâra rupâyi koḍatena holada-waḷaga biḍasari pâlâ | sarva tappa nanda âyit=allâ | ninninda horata gatiy=illâ | Basaliṅgaṇṇana mâta mîrudilla |

---

[44] The allusion here is to a singing-match between two rival parties of ballad-singers. The members of one party have on their drums the *turâ* or 'plume of feathers and pearls and tinsel, with gold and silver lace;' and those of the other party, a *kalagi*, which seems to be 'a plume of feathers for a horse's head.' The two parties sing alternately, until one is declared to have surpassed the others. In the present case the *turâ*-party, to which belonged the composer of this ballad, is declared victorious.

[45] *lit.* "water has descended upon." The metaphor seems to be of Marâṭhî origin; see Molesworth and Candy's Dictionary, s. v. *pôṇî*.

[46] We have here, in *hêḷal-evana*, = *hêḷali* + *avana*, another instance of the customary, though irregular, euphonic conjunction to which attention has been drawn, *ante*, Vol. XV. p. 353, note 19. Other instances occur in verse 7 below, in *koḍar-endâ*, = *koḍari* (*koḍiri*) + *andâ*, and in verse 9, in *naḍir-endâ*, = *naḍiri* + *andâ*.

kai-mugada hiḍadana kâlâ || Chyê || Japti banda-balika yêna hêḷali | índige ninna hola hoyiti | Basaliṅganṇa mâḍidana châti | Phakiraṇṇana jumeka hola âti | Saṅgyâ manige hôgi mâḍyâna chinti | khâteda holâ indige yarav=âti || Iḷava || Matt-onda mâḍyâra, masalatta | nôḍa bêta | Saṅga Pariśyâ ibbaru kûḍi | nagata mâtâḍi | yârig=illa gotta | namma-nimmara woḷagina mâtâ | hîṅg-antâ | yâr-yârige tiḷiya-bârada hîṅga mâḍunu ball-âṅga hôgunu haryâna hotta | avara masadara kuḍagola kunta | kaḍunu anta | indige hôgali namma tali | âguvadu âgali | jîvadinda horatâ || Yêra || Wakkunda wûra Basaliṅga biṭṭa | nâḷe hâkudu mâha-naumi-gaṭṭa || 3 ||

4ne nuḍi.

Maṅgaḷâra udayaka tâ yadda | tâyi-pâdaka hôgi bidda | Saṅgyâ Pariśyâ ibbaru antara Basavaṇṇa naḍasu nama jidda | kuḍagola masada ava hiḍada bagalaga muchchi-koṇḍa tâ naḍada | mûra tâsa hott=êrita âga Phakiraṇṇana manige banda | maniyâga kêḷatâra yelli hôda | bahaḷa kelasa itta avaninda | Tukkaṇṇa antana yâtaka bandi yêna kelasa nana munda || Chyô || Ishṭa kêḷi hindaka tirigi hôda | holadâga hoḷyâga huḍikidâ | ava śikkara prâṇa hôgudâ | Phakîraṇṇana Paramêśwara kâda | huḍiky-âḍi aṅgaḍige banda kappara kâya togoṇḍa wonda || Iḷava || Basavaṇṇa-dêvarige naḍada mâḍi jalada | kâyi waḍada beḷigi kappara mâḍi namaskâra Hoṅgala dâri hiḍidâ | Saṅgaṇṇa banda munda-munda | allinda | Meguṭi-Parasa yên=anda | muñche kaḍun=anda | Râchappana hiḍidâ | hîṅga mâtâḍi pariṇaridinda | wond-ondâ | Râchappana manige hôgi kêḷyâra mudikigi Aṇṇapa yelli hôdâ || Yêra || Kollavanakinta kâyava śrêshṭha | bahaḷa chelo avara adarushṭa || 4 ||

5ne nuḍi.

Bandadd=âti antâra kâli | śiṭṭa âdara tamma manadalli | Basaliṅgaṇṇana manige hôdaro tiḷiyalilla ibbara neli | wombat-tâsa vêḷeda mêle pûrva-likhita wadagiṭa alli | Saṅgyâ Pariśyâ mujari mâḍikyâra hôgi nintaro avana badiyali | Basaliṅgaṇṇana chitta rupâyi mêle | mûru nâku mandi avana badiyalli | kaḍadâru ambudu avaga tiḷiyalilla | Śiva tanda hâkida mâli || Chyê || Saṅgyâ muṅgaiyy-aṅgiya têḍi-koṇḍa bagalanna kuḍagôla takkoṇḍa | ninta nôḍi kaḍadano avana chaṇḍa | adaranta kuḍagôla yaḷa-koṇḍa | kaḍad=avana hindaka sara-koṇḍa | wôḍi hôdana Pariśyânna kara-koṇḍa || Iḷava || Basaliṅganṇa yedda saṅgaṭ-âgi | śira bâgi | bâyili surita nettarâ | hârita kabarâ | biddana jîva hôgi | kunt-iru mandi gâba âgi horaga hôgi | yellaru antara hiḍi hiḍi wôḍatana wôḍi | kôda kuttigi | baruhanta mandi idarigi badig-âgi avana hiḍiyalilla yâr-yârâ | bandara haḷabarâ âga suddy-âgi || Yêra || Ûrâga âdita babbâta | dâṭalilla Hoṅgala gêṭa || 5 ||

6ne nuḍi.

Siṭṭa tîrita avara manad=andâ | mandi kûḍito sutvaradâ | kaiyâna kuḍagôla bisâṭi wogodâna pâpa hôga-goḍalilla mundâ | bikkatta hâdi wôṇiya sandâ | haḷabara hiḍidara mâḍi jaladâ | hoḍa-konta baḍa-konta châwaḍig=ôdara maryâde uḷiyalilla Saṅgyândâ | kulakarṇi banda nôḍidâ | pôlisa-gawaḍa hoḍi andâ | idara-badara Saṅgyâna Pariśyâna kambaka kaṭyâro biga-bigada || Chyê || Suḷḷa baḍiya-bêḍari niva namaga | kaḍad-âṅga kabûl=adêv=îga | nammana hiḍada kaḷavari Saṁpagâṁvyâga | chaukâsi âdita kachêryâga | Hûvina-Râmâ iddana idarâga | ava ayidâna ayidâna Wakkunda-wûrâga || Iḷava || Wakkunda-wûrige hoṇṭaro haḷabarû tayârâ | ava śikka Hûvinâ-Râmâ | âgi bêpâma jîvaka banta gôrâ | adawatige hêḷatâra avara ibbarâ | aññi, naḍagatâna tara-tarâ | id=ena âkâra kaṇṇige tanda nîrâ | ûrâga hêḷatâra dîrâ | yellârâ | î pâpadâga jar illa yên-ên=âgudilla antâra geṇiyarâ || Yêra || Râtô-râtrili ava hoṇṭa | uṇa-goḍalilla wand=îta || 6 ||

7ne nuḍi.

Pôlisa kulakarṇi yên=anda | bahaḷa huśâri ira-bêk=anda | woḷe sâwakârana kaḍada hâkidâra hint-âda âgakilla yend-enda | rapôrṭa mâḍera kâgada barada | haḷaba togoṇḍa Saṁpagâṁvige hôda | kachêri-woḷaga rapôrṭa chelyâna subhêdâra wôdi nôḍida | phaujdâra lagu-bêga tayâra âda | kudurigi taḍi bêga hâk=anda | billi-manushyana togoṇḍa Budhawâra cheñji-vêḷedali ava banda || Chyê || Banda ninta nôḍida phaujdâra | kaṇṇili kaṇḍana nettarâ | heṇa nôḍi maragida maramarâ | ɔ̂ena munidâna Hari-Brahma-dêvarâ | ivana kaḍadâga iddara yâr-yâra | Maṇṭûra ayyagôḷa Pañchappa mûvara || Iḷava || Ishṭa kêḷi maṇṇa koḍar=endâ | aratindâ | tâyi-tandi aḷatâro bôryâḍi | bidda horaḷyâḍi | adarushṭa kam namadâ | yêna kaḍimiy=illa ânandâ dayadindâ | yêna bêḍi bandana Sivanalli namma hottili maga biṭṭa hôdâ | nânâ-pari dukkha strîyaḷadâ | hâkidâ guṇḍa-guḷadâḷi wogadâḷa harada | inn-êna ati nanda | maṇṇigi mari âda || Yêra || Dur-maṇa âdito Vaikuṇṭha | yârige tiḷayado Sivan=âṭa || 7 ||

8ne nuḍi.

Mahanaumi amâsi Sômawâra | Âśwîja śudda pâḍya Maṅgaḷâra | Sako sattarâ-se pañchâ-aiṁśi[47] Rudrôdgâri-nâma-saṁvatsarâ | hîṅga mâḍidara vichâra | pôlisa kulakarṇi phaujdârâ | Saṅgyâna Pariśyâna kaida-woḷaga saṅgaṭa hoṇṭara haḷabarâ | idara mêga bala-huśâra | kachêri-woḷaga hâjarâ | yachchara tappi yattara hôdiri hukuma mâḍidâna mâmledârâ || Chyê || Illi tâlûka biṭṭara Sampagâṁvi | wôda hâkyâra jille Beḷagâṁvi | karasi sâhêba mâḍida nirṇyâyi | Saṅgyâga bidd-âṅga âdita keri bâṁvi | kaṭṭa barada kaḷivyâra Mammâyi | Huvvina-Râmana tandadda anyâyi || Iḷava || Mûra tiṅgalige banta uttarâ-majakûrâ | wôdi nôḍidâna saradârâ | Pariśyâna kari-nîrâ | biḍudu ati pûrâ | Saṅganṇa awala kaididâra | karûra | Dhârwâḍaka sâhêba hôg=anda sajâ gallinda âti jâhirâ | sutta-mutta avanâ mêli pârâ | cheṭigârâ | Dhârwâḍaka hâkidara tanda hunûra mundinda ṭiḷiyalilla jarâ || Yêra || Iṅgreji kâyide bikkaṭṭa | naḍuvadilla yâr-yâra âṭa || 8 ||

9ne nuḍi.

Dhârwâḍa-wûra biṭṭa bandâ | uḷasaṇa âgalilla yârindâ | sâhêba subhêdâra phaujdâra kârkûna Hoṅgalaka tokoṇḍa naḍir=endâ | yachcharike ira-bêka yachcharadinda | hirada katti pârâ hinda mundâ | gallig=hâkudu sâmâna yellâ | Saṅgya chekkaḍi mêga kunt-idda | mâḍi tandaro bali-banda | mâtâḍatâna daraj=illada | Bestâra-divasâ aṇṇa-tammaranâ tanna tâyinû karisidâ || Chyê || Haḍeda tâyavvag=antâno yâk=aḷati | âguhantâd=ellâ âgi hôti | raṇa-maṇḍala Abhimânya nanag=ati | nanaga yâr-yâra illad-âṅga âto sârati | indige riṇa harada hôti | inna biṭṭa-koḍa nanna kakalâti || Iḷava || Ishṭa hêḷi mâḍida aḷâpa | wandu swalpa | nanda hîṅga itta-pramâṇa keṭṭa diwâṇâ | kêḷalilla tappa | mâḍi biṭṭâr=antinni mâpâ varasha ṭêpâ | śikk-âṅga âto kaiśeri Brahma bareda bari mâḍid-antâ tappâ | yoṇṇ-irata hôd-âṅga dîpâ âkalpâ | hint-âda nanna adarushṭa | jidda bali-keṭṭa ira-bârado kôpâ || Yêra || Mâta-mâtige mathana keṭṭa | chelô manushyaga mâtina peṭṭâ || 9 ||

10ne nuḍi.

Santi Sukrawûrâ ada dina suttina mandi kûḍita janâ | havva hâri kabar=illada mâtâḍatâna wûra horaga tandâro avanâ | sâhêbaga hêḷi-koṇḍa yên-êna kai-mugada mâḍida śaraṇa | aida rupâyi kharchu mâḍikyâra maṭhada woḷaga koḍasari maṇṇa | mâri bâḍi âdita saṇṇa kaḷe gundi hârita baṇṇâ | Hara-Harâ anta hâdi

[47] The numeral-words here are Marâṭhî, according to the general custom of the Marâthî people, who use their own words for numbers and dates, even when speaking Kanarese. Amongst other Marâṭhî features in this ballad, due to the composer being a Marâṭhâ, we may note especially the use of the particle *jar*, 'if,' near the end of verse 6.

hiḍadano hatti ninta tanna ṭikâṇa || Chyê || Gallige hâkyâra koraḷigi sarakâ | swargada dari hiḍadâno Kailâsakâ | akka-taṅgera aṇṇa-tammara tâyi dukkha | suttagaṭṭi nintita jana-lôkâ | nâka tiṅgaḷa hanneraḍa dinaka | awarâtri amâsi târîkhâ || Ḷava || Ûra Baiḷ-Hoṅgala doḍḍa śahara | jâhîrâ | sutta râjyada waḷaga hesarâ | Hanumanta-dêvarâ avaga namaskârâ | Tukârâma nanma wastadarâ | śâyirâ-kavi Apu màḍida tayâra | Dêmaṇṇan=akshara illad-âṅga kasara | avara ḍabbina mêga muttina târâ | jartarâ | Santu Basaṇṇa jîvada geṇeyarâ | wairigi mâḍyâra jêra | iḷita kaligigi nîrâ || Yêra || Mâdurâwa kaligige biddâna gaṇṭâ | hâḍina walaga mukapâṭa || 10 ||

SANSKRIT AND OLD-KANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, Bo.C.S., M.R.A.S., C.I.E.

No. 184. — KOMARALINGAM COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF RAVIDATTA.

This inscription, which, I believe, is now edited in full for the first time, was originally brought to notice by Mr. Rice in this Journal, Vol. XII. p. 13. His remarks on it have been reprinted by Mr. Sewell in *Archæol. Surv. South. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 226. And in the same volume, p. 27, No. 185, the original plates are described as being in the possession of Kômaraliṅgam Râmayya, residing at **Kômaraliṅgam** in the Uḍamalpêt Tâlukâ or Sub-Division of the Coimbatore District, Madras Presidency. I edit it from the original plates, which I obtained for examination, through the District authorities, in 1883.

The **plates**, of which the first is inscribed on one side only, but the last on both sides, are three in number, each measuring originally about $8\frac{1}{2}''$ by $3\frac{7}{8}''$. The second plate is entire. Of the first plate, small portions have been broken away at the ends of lines 1, 2, and 5 to 7. And of the third plate, about an inch has been broken away, all the way down, at the ends of the lines. The plates are quite smooth, the edges of them having been neither fashioned thicker nor raised into rims; but the writing is in a state of very good preservation, and is quite legible throughout. — The **ring** on which the plates are strung, passes through ring-holes at the proper right end of each plate. It is a plain copper ring, about $\frac{1}{4}''$ thick and $2\frac{1}{4}''$ in diameter. It had been cut, when the grant came under my notice. No **seal** is forthcoming; and the ring presents no indications of having had a seal attached to it, or of having been soldered into the lower part of a seal. — The **weight** of the three plates is about 1 lb. 2 oz., and of the ring, 2 oz.; total, 1 lb. 4 oz. — The **characters** belong to the southern class of alphabets. The average **size of the letters** is a little over $\frac{1}{8}''$. The engraving is good; but it is not very deep, so that, though the plates are rather thin, the letters do not show through on the reverse sides of them at all. A few of the letters shew marks of the working of the engraver's tool. — **The language** as far as line 15 is Sanskṛit, very bad both idiomatically and from an orthographical point of view. This portion of the record, as far as line 11, is in mixed verse and prose; but the only complete verse is the first, in lines 1-2; the other metrical passages are mere fragments of verses, plainly quoted from some other source or sources, and mixed up in the most remarkable manner with the prose passages that complete the sentences. A perusal of the text by anyone who can understand it, will satisfy him that these metrical passages really are fragments of verses; not words which only incidentally have assumed a metrical shape. In line 16, in the middle of a sentence, the language changes abruptly to a dialect of Old-Kanarese, with a curious mixture of Sanskṛit words and inflections in it; and from that point, as far as line 28, the record is in prose. The remainder of it is in Sanskṛit, with four of the customary benedictive and imprecatory verses in lines 32 to 36. — **The orthography** is so bad throughout, that it is useless to select any points for special notice, except the occurrence of the Drâviḍian *ḷ* in the village name Koḷûr, line 14, and in a few words in the Kanarese portion, and of the Drâviḍian *ṟ* in two words, lines 25 and 26, in the same portion. I will only remark that the use of *ṅga*

(with *g*, not *gh*) for *sinha* in *sinhgavermma*, line 7, and the use of *b* for *v* in *bbasudhâ*, line 33, are in themselves almost sufficient to prove that the record belongs by no means to the early period to which it has been assigned by Mr. Rice.

The inscription purports to be the charter of a grant made by a ruler named **Ravidatta**, while his victorious camp was at a town the name of which is **Kitthipura** as it stands in the text, but was probably intended to be **Kîrtipura**. It is non-sectarian; the object of it being only to record the grant of some villages to some Brâhmans.

As regards the **date**, the grant purports to have been made on Sunday, the new-moon day of the month Phâlguna, under the Rêvatî *nakshatra*, and on the occasion of an eclipse of the sun. But no reference is made to any era; and Ravidatta is not known from any other record. Consequently, the details cannot be tested by calculation.

Of the **places** mentioned in addition to **Kitthipura or Kîrtipura**, the first village is **Puṅgisoge**, which is defined as being in the east-central *dêśa* in **the Kuḍugûr nâḍu in the Punnâḍu vishaya**. The other villages granted are **Koḷûr, Kodamûku, Dvatogeyanûr, Tânagundûr**, and **Paṭṭal**. And the village of **Eḷagovanûr** is mentioned in the specification of boundaries. All of these names remain to be identified. Mr. Rice (*ante*, Vol. XII. p. 13) has suggested that **Punnâḍu** appears as Pannata and Pannuta in Lassen and Yule's maps of Ancient India; and has added his opinion as to its modern representative. As indicated by him, **the Punnâḍu vishaya** of this record is doubtless identical with the Pûnâḍu district, supposed to be a Ten-thousand district, which is mentioned in the Merkara grant (*ante*, Vol. I. p. 365, and *Mysore Inscriptions*, p. 283). And the statement in line 30 of the present record, that the witnesses were the subjects of the Ninety-six-thousand *vishaya*, shews that the Punnâḍu *vishaya* was **a sub-division of the well-known Gaṅgavâḍi Ninety-six-thousand**. But it is difficult to follow his further identification of the Pûnâḍu Ten-thousand (?) with "the Padinâḍ or Ten Nâḍ country," mentioned in the Yelandur inscription of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries A.D. (*Mysore Inscriptions*, p. 334 ff.), which he has located in the south-east of Maisûr (*id.* p. xliii.), and the name of which, he tells us, "survives in the existing Hadinâḍu, now corrupted into Hadinâru, a village on the Kabbani river, not far from its junction with the Kâvêrî." Hadinâru (*hadin-âru*), if this is exactly the right spelling of the name, means 'sixteen.' And there are the following objections to Mr. Rice's identification. In the first place, it is at least extremely doubtful whether the *ḍ* of *nâḍu* can change, or even can be corrupted, into *r* in Hadinâru, except in the preparation of an English map by someone who would confuse the two sounds. Secondly, though the syllables *hadi*, or *padi* in the older stage of the language, do mean 'ten' in *hadi-mûru*, 'thirteen,' and in *hadi-nâlku*, 'fourteen,' yet, as the second part of the word is not a numeral, it is not easy to see how they can be used in that sense in such a name as Hadinâḍu or Padinâḍu; assuming again that this is exactly the right spelling, and that the second syllable is really *di*, not *ḍi*. And, thirdly, it is still more difficult to imagine how the first two syllables of Padinâḍu came to be substituted for the *pun* or *pû* of Punnâḍu or Pûnâḍu. The identification seems really to be based upon the supposition that each division of "the Padinâḍ or Ten Nâḍ country" contained one thousand villages, in support of which there is, at any rate, nothing in the Yelandur inscription; and upon the view that the Pûnâḍu *vishaya* was a Ten-thousand district. This latter point rests upon the opinion, held by Dr. Burnell (*South-Ind. Palæo.* p. 67), that in the Merkara grant, line 18, a certain *akshara*, which stands between the words *Pûnâḍu* and *sahaśra* (*sic*), is the numerical symbol for 'ten.' But the form of the *akshara* as given in Dr. Burnell's book, differs essentially from the form that it has in the lithograph of the grant (*ante*, Vol. I. p. 362). Nor, as it stands in the lithograph, does the *akshara* really resemble closely any of the known forms of the symbol for 'ten.' As it stands, it distinctly reads as *chhâ*. Without, at any rate, an inspection of the original plate, I will not venture to say what it may mean. But, because it does not agree with the known forms of the symbol for 'ten,' and because the use of a numerical symbol at all is so unlikely in the period to which the Merkara plates really belong, and still more because the use of a numerical symbol as part of a compound, with a fully written word on each side of it, is so very extraordinary that without

genuine analogous instances it cannot possibly be accepted, I cannot take it as proved even that the Punnâḍu *vishaya* was a Ten-thousand district.

As regards the full genealogical and historical purport of this inscription, it will be desirable to quote here exactly what was said about it by Mr. Rice, who brought it to notice in connection with the Kaḍaba grant of Prabhûtavarsha-Gôvinda III., dated Saka-Saṁvat 735 expired, — of which, by the way, the authenticity is at least very doubtful He wrote (*ante*, Vol. XII. p. 13):— "I have, through the kindness of Mr. R. Sewell, seen a grant of the "Punnâṭa Râjas which must belong to early in the sixth century. In it their succession is "thus given: — (1) Kâśyappa Râshṭravarmma; (2) Nâgadatta, his son; (3) Singa Varmma, "son of the last; (4) his son (not named); (5) Skandavarmma, son of the last; (6) Ravidatta, "his son. The addition to the first name may point to a suzerainty of the Râshṭrakûṭas. "But from other inscriptions (*ante*, Vol. V. p. 140, Vol. VII. p. 175; *Mysore Inscriptions*, "pp. 292, 295) we know that in the time of Skandavarmma the Punnâḍ kingdom was "annexed to the Gaṅga dominions by Avinîta who married the king's daughter." Of the two references given by him, only in the first (*ante*, Vol. V. p 140, and *Mysore Inscriptions*, p. 292), and in no other document, can I find the passage which he intends. This is one of the Mallôhaḷḷi grants; and from it we learn that the son of Koṅgaṇimahâdhirâja, of the Western Gaṅga line, was Avinîta, otherwise named Koṅgaṇivṛiddharâja and Durvinîta, "whose broad chest "was embraced by the beloved daughter of Skanda Varmma, the Punnâḍ Râja[1] who herself "had chosen him though from her birth assigned by her father, according to the advice of his "own guru, to the son of another," and who was "the ruler of the whole of Pânnâḍ "(? Pâkhâḍ) and Punnâḍ." Now, this Mallôhaḷḷi grant, though Mr. Rice will not see it, is a spurious grant, belonging to a much later period than the date, Saka-Saṁvat 435 or A.D. 513-514, to which he has referred it (*ante*, Vol. V. p. 140). This date was arrived at by him as part and parcel of his theories regarding the Western Gaṅgas, which are erroneous throughout, because they are based on nothing but a series of spurious and unreliable grants. And, having given up his original suggestion that Punnâṭarâja-Skandavarman, the father-in-law of Avinîta, might be a Pallava king or a feudatory of a Pallava king (*ante*, Vol. V. p. 135), and having identified him instead with the Skandavarman of the present record, it followed that, having fixed Saka-Saṁvat 400 or A.D. 478-79 for the beginning of the reign of Avinîta, he was naturally obliged, as part and parcel of his theories, to refer to an early period in the sixth century A.D. the present grant of Ravidatta, whom he took to be the son of Skandavarman. I shall dismiss, without further comment, the exact dates arrived at by him. It is only necessary to point out that his remarks quoted above shew plainly that he treated the present inscription of Ravidatta as a genuine record; and that he used it for historical purposes, either as corroborative of, or as corroborated by, another record, which he supposes to be genuine and ancient.

I differ considerably from Mr. Rice in my interpretation of this inscription. In the first place, instead of finding six generations in unbroken succession of father and son, with Ravidatta in the last of them, I find that Skandavarman's son was Punnâṭarâja, and that Ravidatta is simply mentioned as a descendant of Punnâṭarâja, — with what interval between them it is impossible to say. In making Ravidatta the son of Skandavarman, Mr. Rice seems to have taken the word *Punnâṭarâjasya*, line 9, simply as an epithet, either of Skandavarman or of Ravidatta, meaning that the person to whom it applies was a ruler of the Punnâṭa or Punnâḍu country. The construction of the passage is, of course, bad to a degree; and especially so is the use, — evidently intentional, though the vowel *á* has been omitted, — of the Taddhita affix *áyana*, which is restricted to the special words *âmushyáyaṇa* and *dvyámushyáyaṇa*, and to such derivatives as Âśvalâyana, Bâdarâyaṇa, Kâtyâyana, &c, and which cannot be correctly used as it has been here, *viz.* as a separate word after *Punnâṭarâjasya* which is in apposition with *tat-putrasya*. But, doing the best that is possible with the text, it certainly

[1] The original, however, distinctly has *punnâṭarâja*, like the present inscription. — I have quoted this passage from its later version, *Mysore Inscriptions*, p. 292. In *ante*, Vol. V. p. 140, the only difference is that we have "of the Punnâḍ râja Skanda Varmma."

seems to mean that Skandavarman's son was named Punnâṭarâja, and that Ravidatta was a descendant of the latter person, in some unspecified degree. In the second place, it is impossible to agree with Mr. Rice in taking Nâgadatta's son to be Siṅgavarman, *i.e.* Siṁhavarman. The text, line 7, distinctly gives the name of Nâgadatta's son in the word *bhujagâṁvarâgaḥ*, which, judged by the metre, seems to stand for *bhujaṁgâdhirâjaḥ*. And it proceeds to mention, not a son, but a daughter of Siṅgavarman; and she is plainly intended to be introduced as the wife of Nâgadatta's son, though the exact words are missing. And in the third place, I do not feel quite sure that we have the whole of the inscription before us. I do not find any record as to whether the ring was still uncut when the grant first came to notice; and even if it were so, it is possible that an original ring, with a seal attached to it, was abstracted; that the present plain ring was substituted; and that, in the course of this, part of the original charter was lost. The doubt arises in connection with the context of lines 7 and 8. The last two letters of the first plate, in line 7, have been broken away. And it is impossible to supply for them anything that can satisfactorily connect the last extant word on this plate with the first word on the second plate, in such a way as to give what is required here, *viz.* the name of Siṅgavarman's daughter, and the distinct mention of her as the wife of Bhujaṁgâdhirâja (?). Either her name and the other words were carelessly omitted altogether; or else they came on another plate which, possibly with others also, is now missing between lines 7 and 8. In the face, however, of the worthlessness of the whole inscription, this is not a point of any special importance And, assuming, as Mr. Rice plainly did, that the entire record is practically before us, I find that it gives **the following succession of names**: — (1) Râshṭravarman, who seems to be described as belonging to the Kâśyapa *gôtra*; (2) his son, Nâgadatta; (3) his son, Bhujaṁgâdhirâja (?), who married a daughter of Siṅgavarman, *i.e.* Siṁhavarman, but the name of whose wife either was omitted or has been wrapped up in some unrecognisable shape in the syllables *vidyâ* . . . . *nayanô*, line 7-8; (4) his son, Skandavarman; (5) his son, Punnâṭarâja; and (6) his descendant in some unspecified degree, Ravidatta. In the description of these persons, there is nothing to indicate anything higher than feudal rank. And, on the other hand, the statement that Ravidatta made the grant with the permission of **Cheramma**, seems not only to shew plainly that he was merely a subordinate chieftain, but also to give the name of his master. His authority was probably confined to the Punnâḍu *vishaya*, which is the first and chief territorial division mentioned in specifying the position of Puṅgisoge.

I also differ entirely from Mr. Rice in **my appreciation of the value of this inscription.** Amongst its peculiarities, **the first point** that attracts attention is the abrupt manner in which, after the words *Ôm Svasti*, it opens with a verse that commences with *tad=anu jayati*, "after that, victorious is . . . . . Ravidatta." This abrupt opening shews that the record is not complete even at the beginning of it, and that at any rate some invocatory verse or verses, which ought to have been included, must have been omitted here; compare, for instance, the Junâgaḍh inscription of Skandagupta (*Gupta Inscriptions*, p. 58), and the Aihoḷe inscription of Pulikêśin II. (*ante*, Vol. VIII. p. 241), which open with an invocation of respectively Vishṇu and Jinêndra, and then introduce the reigning kings with verses of which one, that in the Junâgaḍh inscription, commences with *tad=anu jayati*, and the other, that in the Aihoḷe inscription, commences with *tad=anu*, having *jayati* at the end of the second *pâda*. **The next point**, of course, is the extraordinary corruptness of the Sanskṛit portion. With the exception of the opening verse, which very curiously contains only one real mistake, viz. *sampadânti* for *sampatanti*, the errors, both of idiom and of orthography, are of a more marked kind even than in the ordinary spurious inscriptions. I cannot call to mind any other instance in which the idiom and construction are faulty to the same extent. But the orthographical mistakes are of the kind which occur more or less in all the spurious grants, except in the British Museum plates of Pulikêśin I., dated Śaka-Saṁvat 411 expired (*ante*, Vol. VII. p. 209 ff.), and in the Pimpaḷnêr plates of Pulikêśin I. or II., dated Śaka-Saṁvat 310 (*ante*, Vol. IX. p. 293); and in no genuine grants, except

perhaps some of the latest of the Valabhî records. Another point is the wonderful mixture of verse and prose in lines 2 to 11; in respect of which, as I have said above, anyone who can understand the text can satisfy himself that the metrical passages really are fragments of verses, taken plainly from some other document, and not words which only incidentally have assumed a metrical shape. For this I can call to mind no parallel whatever. And another point is the abrupt transition from Sanskṛit to Old-Kanarese in line 10, not only in the middle of a sentence, but even in passing from an adjective in Sanskṛit, used moreover erroneously in the nominative case, to the Kanarese dative which it is intended to qualify. For this, again, I can call to mind no analogous instance. In fine, how anyone can apply the present record seriously, is to me quite incomprehensible. The points to which I have drawn attention stamp it unmistakably as a document that has been pieced together, in the most careless fashion, and by a very ignorant and clumsy person, from perhaps half-a-dozen different sources; so that, whatever substratum of fact there may be in any of the passages included in it, taken as a whole it is a worthless document, utterly useless for any historical purposes. It is by no means the first specimen of its kind from the same part of the country. On the spurious Western Gaṅga grants, of which one is the Mallôhaḷḷi record referred to above, through which the present record has been connected with them, I have written elsewhere (*Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts*, p. 11 ff). Wearisome as is the task of dealing in detail with such records, I have now treated fully of the present inscription, because, like the Western Gaṅga grants, and in special connection with one of them, it has misguidedly and misleadingly been accepted from a serious point of view; and because, in the face of such treatment, it was necessary that its nature should be plainly exhibited. As far as it can be determined palæographically, and especially by the marked wave in the upper part of the vowel *â* as attached to consonants, which first began to appear about the end of the seventh century A. D.,—see, for instance, the Harihar grant of the Western Chalukya king Vinayâditya, *ante*, Vol. VII. p. 300, Plate,—the date of its concoction might perhaps be placed about the commencement of the eighth century A.D.; but certainly no earlier. As, however, I cannot find any date in the eighth century which gives us the Rêvatî *nakshatra*, at sunrise or at any time during the day, coupled with an eclipse of the sun on a Sunday answering to either the *pûrṇimânta* or the *amânta* Phâlguna new-moon, it would appear that, unless the given details are purely imaginative, the record must be referred to a later time than A. D. 800.

TEXT.[2]

First Plate.

1 Ôṁ[3] Svasti [||*] Tad[4]=anu jayati râjâ râjamâna[ḥ*] sva-dîptyâ ravir=iva Ravidattô dattavân dharmma[5]-kâraḷ d[iśi]-

2 diśi vijit-âr̃êr=yyasya vîryya-pratâpâḥ sakalam=avani-dêśaṁ santataṁ sampadâ(ta)nti [||*] Vidyâ-v[i]-

3 nâ(na)y-âtivihita-vṛittaḥ nîti[6]-śâstra-prayôgâ[t*] âsîd=râjâ vidita-vijayaḥ Kâśyapô

4 Râshṭrave(va)rmmâ tat-putrô=bhût samara-mukha-hata-prâ(pra)hṛta-śûrapurusha-turaga-va-

5 ra-vârê(ra)ṇa[ḥ*] chaturddasa(śa)-vidyâsthân-âdhigata-vimala-ma[7]tiḥ gaja-varu(rû)tha-gatir[8]=Nnâgadattô narêndraḥ tat-putraśya

6 rddânta[9]-vimardda-vimṛidita-viśvamba(mbha)râdhipa-mauli-mâl[â*]-maka r a n d a-p u ṁ j a-piṁjari[ta]-śutra-chchô(chû)ḍâ-vih[i*]ta-yaśas-sâsa . .

---

[1] From the original plates. [2] Represented by a symbol.

[3] Metre, Mâlinî. This is the only complete verse in the body of the grant.

[4] After this *rmma*, a *na* or *n* seems to have been engraved and cancelled.

[5] Metre, Mandâkrântâ; as far as *putrô-bhût* or *samara*.

[6] First *mi* was engraved; and then the *i* was partially cancelled.

[7] Metre, Mandâkrântâ or Sragdharâ; as far as *narêndraḥ*. [8] Read *chaturddanta*.

7 nîyân k[û*]nty[10]=Ânaṁgô yuvatishu nṛipa-śri(śrî)-**Bhu**[11]**jagâṁvarâgaḥ**[12] **śrî**[13]**-Siṁga-ve(va)rmma**[14]**-**nṛipatês=tanayâ vibhâti vidyâ . . . .

Second Plate; First Side.

8 nayanô[15] tat-putrasya sva-bhuja-bala-parâkrama-kraya-vîryya-sampanna-**Skanda-ve(va)rmmaṇa**[ḥ*] tat-pu-

9 trasya **Punnâṭa-râjasy**=[û*]yanô dṛiṁta[16] s[v*]a-bhuja-vikrama-datta-mâly-[û*]dêr=Ê(i)ndra[17]-vikramô mṛi-

10 daṁga-gavira[18]-ninâda-nisvanaḥ samasta-sâmanta-tha(bha)ṭa-pravarddhana[ḥ*] praśâsti râjâ suchiraṁ vasundharâ[ṁ*]

11 śrîmân **Ravidatta-**nâmadhêyaḥ [ll*] **Kitthi**[19]**-puravarav(m)**=adhivasati vijaya-skândâvârê[20] **Cheramm-anu-**

12 jñcyât[21] **Pâlgunamâsyaṁ**[22] **Âdityavârê Rêvati(tî)-nakshatrê sûryya-grâhâṇê**[23] **Punnâḍu-**

13 vishayê **Kudugûr-**nnâḍoḷ pûrvva-madhya-dêsê **Puṅgisoge-**nâma-grâmaṁ(ḥ) udaka-pûrvvan=dattaḥ Dvivi-vi-

14 prasya sarvva-bâda(dha)-parihârê[ṇa*] janma-kshêtraṁ **Koḷu(ḷû)r-**nnâma-grâmaṁ Sômasa(śa)rmma-bhaṭṭaḥ **Kodamûku-**nâ-

15 ma-grâmaṁ Kumba(mbha)sa(śa)rmma-bhaṭṭaḥ **Dvatogeyanûr-**nnâma-grâmaṁ Kâśyapa-gôtraḥ Kâmarave(va)rmma-shaḍâ(ḍa)ṁ-

Second Plate; Second Side.

16 gaviya(da?)rggaṁ Âtrêya-gôtrâya Paḍuvasa(śa)rmmagaṁ inti irvvorggaṁ ôkô bhâgaṁ(ḥ) sê(śê)shasya ja-

17 nma-kshêtraṁ chêvatraṁ[24] **Tânagundûr-**nnâma-grâmaṁ Śrîdhara-chauvêra-putrasya Biṇamma-dvêdi[25] **Paṭṭa-**

18 l-nâma-grâmaṁ dvija[26]-guru-dêvatâ-pûdya[27]-Gaṇanâyaka tutyâ[28] samasta-ni(nî)ti-śâstra-prayôgi

19 Têtriya[29]-charaṇa-prâ(pra)vachana-kalpa Vatsa-gôtraḥ Mâda(dha)va-chauvêrarggaṁ îsan[30] Kâṇvâ-

20 yana-sagôtraḥ Kêsa(śa)va-kramayitarggaṁ inti irvvorggaṁ êkô bhâgaṁ(ḥ) dvishu bhâga-

21 sya tasya sîmântarâṇi pûrvvasyân=disi(śi) kammâtthivâya allim vîrttandakolliya paḷa-

22 mpeyâle tuḷdilgâlâ-mûṭâyoḷbe ebeḷḷa[31]degalla-mû(?)ṭâya poreë(ye) bandu teruṇa(?)-bâ(?)lliya(?ye)

23 bandu **Eḷagovanûra** baḍaguṇa si(sî)meyuḷ ku(kû)ḍi dakshiṇasyân=disi(śi) ka(?)ḷipoḷekkâl-tenne(nno)ḷbe taḷa . .

---

[10] Metre, Mandâkrântâ; as far as *bhujagâṁvarâgaḥ* for *bhujaṁgâdhirâjaḥ*.

[11] This *bhu* was at first omitted, and was then inserted below the line, with a mark to indicate the omission.

[12] Some correction is necessary here; and *bhujaṁg-âdhirâjaḥ* would satisfy the requirements of the metre, and agrees pretty closely which what is actually engraved.

[13] Metre, Vasantatilaka; as far as *vidyâ*. [14] First *rmmâ* was engraved; and then the *â* was partially cancelled.

[15] As regards the connection between this and the preceding line, see the introductory remarks.

[16] What was intended here is not apparent.

[17] Metre, Vaṁśastha; as far as *vasundharâṁ*.

[18] Read *gambhîra*.

[19] Read, perhaps, *kîrtti*.

[20] Read *skandhâvârê*.

[21] Read *ânujñâyâ*.

[22] Read *phâlgun-âmâvâsyâṁ*.

[23] Read *grahaṁ*.

[24] This may perhaps be intended for *ch=aiv=âtra*.

[25] Read *dvivêdi*, or *duvêdi*.

[26] This *ja* was at first omitted, and then was inserted, in a very cramped style, between the *dvi* and the *gu*.

[27] This is perhaps a mistake for *pûjya*.

[28] What was intended here is not apparent.

[29] Read *taittirîya*.

[30] What was intended here is not apparent.

[31] After this *ḷla*, some letter seems to have been engraved and cancelled.

Third Plate; First Side.

24 . . . . n . . b . . boṇarkkellodiḷḍa aduviṁ bada(ṕḍa) oḷbe ekkuṭṭaṁ . . dîrggase . . . . . .

25 âlakkâl-tennoḷbe ekiṟuvadikkâl-tennoḷbe ekuḷḍakkâl-tennoḷbe ekarkkâlliku . . b . . . . . .

26 ba(ṕbe)rkku-geṟeyalliye va(ba)ndu suṇṇa-kkolliyoḷ ku(kû)ḍittu paśchimasyân=disi(śi) suṇṇa-kkolli . . . . . .

27 di bandu kuṇḍinadoḷ=ku(kû)ḍi baḍaga rekkakadadubadagây-veṭṭadiṁ biḷḍa-kolliya ṭa(ṕu) . . . . . .

28 beṭṭada mêl-poraḷe bandu mûḍây-si(śî)meyuḷ ku(kû)ḍittu || Tat-kâlê tad-vishayê kada . . . . . .

29 sya udaka-pûrvvaṁ dattaḥ kṛitya-kuchcha-vyavahârô agra-vâkyê agra-pûje pa . . . . [|| A]-

30 sya dânasya sâkshiṇaḥ shaṇṇavatisahâ(ha)sra-vishaya-prakṛitayaḥ [||*] Yô=sy=âpa[harttâ]

31 [m]ôhât=pramô(mâ)dêna vâ sa pañchabhir=mahâbhi tpâtakai[32] saṁyuktô bhavati yô râ(ra)kshati ssa(sa) puṇyâ(ṇya)m=a[vâpnôti ||]

Third Plate; Second Side.

32 [S]v[an][33]=d[â]taṁ su-mahach-chhakyaṁ duḥkham=anyasya pâlanaṁ dânaṁ vâ pâlanaṁ v=êti dânâch=chhrê[yô=nupâla]-

33 naṁ [||*] Bahubhir=bba(vva)sudhâ bhuktâ râjabhis=Sagar-âdhi(di)bhiḥ yasya yasya yadâ bhû[mis=tasya tasya]

34 tadâ phalaṁ || Sarvv[â*]n[34]=êtâ[n*] prârtthayaty=êpa(va) Râmô bhûyô-bhûyô[35] bhâvinaḥ pâ[rtthivêndrân sâ]-

35 mânyô=yaṁ dharmma-sêtur=nṛipâṇâṁ kâlê-kâlê pâlani(nî)yô mahâ(ha)dbhiḥ ||* Bra[hma-svaṁ[36] tu vi]-

36 shaṁ ghôṁraṁ[37] na bhi(vi)shaṁ visham=uchyatê visham=ôkâkinaṁ hanti brahma-svaṁ pu[t]ra-[pautrikaṁ ||]

ABSTRACT OF CONTENTS.

After the words "Ôm! Hail!", the record opens with a verse introducing the name of the king **Ravidatta** (line 1), by whom, as we learn further on, the grant purports to have been made. The verse begins with the words *tad=anu jayati*, "after that, victorious is . . . . . , Ravidatta;" which shew that at any rate some invocatory verse has been omitted here.

It then gives Ravidatta's genealogy. It states that there was a 'king' named **Râshṭravarman** (l. 4), who seems to be described as belonging to **the Kâśyapa gôtra** (l. 3). His son was 'king' **Nâgadatta** (l. 5). His son was the 'king,' the illustrious **Bhujaṁgâdhirâja** (l. 7), if we accept the correction that suits the metre and is suggested by the syllables that actually occur; and in connection with this person, and evidently as his wife, mention is made of **a daughter of the 'king,' the illustrious Siṅgavarman**, but her name either was omitted or cannot be made out. His son was **Skandavarman** (l. 8) His son was **Punnâṭarâja** (l. 9). And his descendant is the 'king,' the illustrious **Ravidatta** (l. 11), who has now been governing the earth for a long time.

While his, Ravidatta's, victorious camp is **at the town of Kitthipura, or perhaps Kîrtipura**, which is the best of towns (l. 11), with the permission of **Cheramma, on the new-moon day of Phâlguna (l. 12), on Sunday, under the Rôvatî nakshatra, and at an eclipse of the sun, the village named Puṅgisoge** (l. 13), which is described as being in the east-central *dêśa*

---

[32] Read *mahadbhiḥ pâtakaiḥ*, or *mahâpâtakaiḥ*.

[33] Metre, Ślôka (Anushṭubh); and in the next verse,

[34] Metre, Śâlinî.

[35] First *bhâvinaḥ* was engraved here, and then it was corrected into *bhûyô*,

[36] Metre, Ślôka (Anushṭubh).

[37] Read *ghôraṁ*.

in the Kudugur nâḍ which is in the Punnâḍu vishaya, has been granted, free of all obstruction, apparently to a Brâhman named Dvivivipra.

Also the following grants seem to have been made. The village of Koḷûr (l. 14), to Sômaśarmabhaṭṭa; the said village apparently being his birth-place (*janmakshêtra*). The village of Kodamûku, to Kumbhaśarmabhaṭṭa. One share, apparently, of the village of Dvatogeyanûr (line 15), to Kâmaravarmashaḍaṅgavid, of the Kâśyapa *gôtra*, and to Paḍuvaśarman of the Âtrêya *gôtra*; and the text seems to intimate that their birth-place was here, and that the rest of the village belonged to them by right of that fact. The village of Tânagundûr (l. 17), to Biṇammadvivêdin, the son of Śrîdharachauvêra. And, apparently, one portion of the village of Paṭṭal to Gaṇanâyaka, and the other to Mâdhavachauvêra, of the Taittirîya *charaṇa* and the Vatsa *gôtra*, and to Kêśavakramayita of the Kâṇvâyana *gôtra*.

Lines 20 to 28 contain a specification of boundaries, in the course of which there is mentioned the village of Eḷagovanûr (l. 23). But it is not clear whether the boundaries are those of Puṅgisoge; or of all the villages, on the understanding that they formed one compact block; or of a portion only of the lands that were granted.

Lines 28-29 seem to refer to some other grant which was made at the same time, but the nature of which is not apparent. Lines 29-30 state that the witnesses to the grant were the subjects of the Ninety-six-thousand vishaya. And lines 30 to 36 contain a precept in prose, and four of the customary Sanskṛit benedictive and imprecatory verses, with which the record ends.

WEBER'S SACRED LITERATURE OF THE JAINS.

TRANSLATED BY DR. HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

(*Continued from p.* 184.)

As the sixth of the *dasâu* texts the paṇhâvâgaraṇadasâu are named. This is to be sure the name of the tenth *aṅga*, which is also divided into 10 *dâras* but not into 10 *ajjh.* The names of the ten *ajjh.* quoted here show very plainly that here, as in the case of *aṅgas* 8, 9, the author had quite a different, and in fact an older, text before him than the one we now possess. These names are in agreement with the name of the *aṅga* itself, whereas our text of this *aṅga* shows no connection with it. The names are · *uvamâ, saṁkhâ, isibhâsiyâiṁ*,[1*] *âyariyabhâsiyâiṁ, Mahâvîrabhâsiyâiṁ, khômagapasiṇâiṁ, kômalapasiṇâiṁ, addâgapasiṇâiṁ, aṁguṭṭhapasiṇâiṁ. bâhupasiṇâiṁ.* The names of *ajjh.* 6, 8, 9, 10 recur in that table of contents of *aṅga* 10 which is found in *aṅga* 4 (and *Nandî*) so that there the text which existed at the period of *aṅga* 3 and not our present text, is meant. Abhayadêva says, in so many words: *praśnavyâkaraṇadaśâ ihô 'ktarûpâ na dṛiśyaṁtê, dṛiśyamânâs tu paṁchâśravapaṁchasaṁvarâtmikâ iti, ihôktânâṁ tû'pamâdînâm adhyayanânâm aksharârthaḥ* [273] *pratîyamâna êvê ti.*[2]

The names of the following four dasâu do not recur elsewhere. The names of the 10 *ajjh.* of *dasâ* 10 are mentioned, not as parts of the *Siddhânta* but as belonging in or to it. In the seventh place appear the *baṁdhadasâu*, the 10 *ajjh.* of which have the following names: *baṁdhê*[3] *ya mokkhê ya dêviḍḍhî* Dasâramaṁḍalê *ti ya* | *âyariyavipaḍivattî uvajjhâyavippaḍivattî* | *bhâvaṇâ vimottî sâsatê kammê.* In the eighth place we find the *dôgiddhidasâu* (*dvigṛiddhi*°) with the following names[4] *vâtê vivâtê sukhettê kasiṇê ti ya* | *bâyâlîsaṁ suviṇâ tîsaṁ mahâsuviṇâ hârê*[5] Râmaguttê *ya êyam êê dasa âhiyâ.*[6] In the ninth place the *dîha-dasâu* with following names: *chaṁdê sûrê ya sukkê ya*, Siridêvî, Pabhâvaî | *dîvasamuddôvavattî*, Bahuputti, Maṁdarê ti ya | *thêrê* Saṁbhûyavijaê, *thêrê* Pamha-ussâsanissâsê ||. Abhayadêva points out here some connection with the *narakâvalikâ-*, or *nirayâvalikâ-*

1* This text is treated in greater detail on *aṅga* 4 § 44.—It has been discovered by Prof. Peterson, see his Third Report, p. 26 and 253.—L.

2 kshaumakâdishu dêvatâvatârah kriyata iti, tatra kshaumakaṁ vastram, addâgô âdarśaḥ.

3 baṁdhâdy-adhyayanâni, śrautênâ'rthêna vyâkhyâtavyâni.

4 *dvigṛihi* (!) *daśâi cha svarûpatô 'py anavasitâḥ.* 5 *var.: harê, hâlê.*

6 These are but nine; in a MS. belonging to Sir Mon. Williams, according to Leumann, *bâvattariṁ savvasumiṇâ* are named in the tenth place. For the dreams cf. the *mahâsuviṇâ* above, p. 224, also cited among the *anaṅgapaviṭṭha* texts in the Pâkshikas. and in the *Vidhipr.*

śrutaskandha, i.e. *upâṅgas* 8—12.[7] Finally in the tenth place are the *saṁkhêviyadasâu*[8] with the foll. names *khuḍḍiyâ vimâṇapavibhattî*, *mahalliyâ vimâṇa*[274]*pavibhattî*, *aṁgachûliyâ*, *vaggachûliyâ vivâhachûliyâ*, Aruṇôvavâê, Varaṇôvavâê (Varu° in the Schol., perhaps Dhara°) Garulôvavâê, Vêlaṁdharôvavâê, Vêsamaṇôvavâê. All these names recur in the *aṇaṅgapaviṭṭha* list of the *Nandî* (*Pâkshikas. Vidhipr.*). We have seen above, p. 223, 224, that the five[9] *ajjhayaṇas* beginning with *khuḍḍiyavimâṇa*, are designed for the eleventh year of study, the five[9] *ajjh.*, which begin with *aruṇôvavâda* for the twelfth year of study. From this two facts are plain: first, that they still existed at the date of composition of the *versus memoriales* in question, secondly, that they were of great importance in so far as their study is made to occur after that designed for *aṅga* 5 *i.e.* the tenth year. By *vivâhachûliyâ* (*vyâkhyâ bhagavatî*, *tasyâś chûlikâ*) we may remark in passing, we are to understand one or more of those supplements to *aṅga* 5, all of which now appear to have been incorporated in that *aṅga*.

We cannot doubt that all the texts mentioned above were thus constituted at the period of the existence of *aṅga* 3. Hence the extreme interest of this detailed presentation of the subject. It is only as regards *aṅga* 7 and *chhêdasûtra* 4 that this account is in entire agreement with the existing text of the *Siddhânta*; in all other particulars this account is either widely different or has reference to texts,[10] which are not found in the Siddhânta at all. The proof here given of the fact that from the mention of a work in one place or another there does not [275] follow the identity of the then existing texts with the present (though in reality proof of a fact that is self-evident) is nevertheless not out of place in the present case, since it has become so customary in these days to draw from the titles of Chinese, etc., translations of Buddhistic works conclusions in reference to the existence of the latter in their present form. The proof here carried out in reference to *aṅga* 8 to 10 is intended as a reminder that greater caution must be used in the future. (See *Ind. Stud.* III. 140).

Of great interest is furthermore the enumeration in *ajjh.* 7 of the names of the **seven schisms**[11] together with those of their founders and of their localities: *êvaṁ chêva samaṇassa bhagavatô* Mahâvîrassa *titthaṁmi satta pavayaṇaṇiṁhagâ paṁ taṁ: bahuraygâ, jîvapadêsiyâ, avvattiyâ, sâmuchchhêtiyâ, dôkiriyâ, têrâsiyâ, avaḍḍhiyâ* (*!*); *êêsi ṇaṁ sattaṇhaṁ pavayaṇaṇiṁhagâṇaṁ satta dhammâyariyâ hotthâ, taṁ: Jamâlî, Tîsagutte Âsâḍhê, Âsamittê, Gaṁgê, Chalue, Gotthâmâhilê*; *êêsi ṇaṁ pa°ṇaṁ satta uppattinagarâ hotthâ, taṁ:* Sâvatthî, Usabhapuraṁ, Sêyabiyâ, Mihilâ, Ullagâtîraṁ, *puraṁ* Aṁtaraṁji, Dasapura(ṁ) *niṁhaga-uppattinagarâiṁ*. According to *Âvaśy. niśj.* 8, 61. 88, the last of those schisms occurred in the year Vîra 584; from this we may derive some basis for chronological determination.[12*] See Jacobi, *Kalpas.* p. 15.

An exact examination of this important text is a great desideratum, since in it are contained a large number of significant [276] statements and data. It constitutes a perfect treasure-house for the correct understanding of innumerable groups of conceptions, in distinguishing which from one another the pedantic formalism of the Jains was wont to run riot.

The table of contents in *aṅga* 4 and *Nandî* (N) reads: sê kiṁ taṁ ṭhâṇê ? thâṇê ṇaṁ sasamayâ ṭhâvijjaṁti parasamayâ sasamayaparasamayâ; jîvâ ṭhâvijjaṁti ajîvâ jîvâjîvâ; lôgê alôgê lôgâlôgê ṭhâvijjaṁti;[13] ṭhâṇê ṇaṁ davva-guṇa-khetta-kâla-pajjavapayatthâ ṇaṁ sêlâ salilâ

---

[7] dîrghadaśâḥ svarûpatô'navagatâ êva, tad-adhyayanâni (kâni) chin narakâvalikâ-śrutaskaṁdha upalabhyaṁtê; tatra chaṁdravaktavyatâpratibaddhaṁ chaṁdram adhyayanaṁ, tathâ hi: Râjagrihê . . .; śêshâṇi trîṇy apratîtâni.

[8] saṁkshêpikâ dasâ apy anavagatasvarûpâ êva, tadadhyayanânâm punar arthaḥ: khuḍḍiê tyâdi, ihâ'valikâpravishṭâ'taravimânapravibhajanaṁ yatrâ 'dhyayanê tad vimânapravibhaktiḥ, tach chai 'kaṁ alpagraṁthârthaṁ, tathâ 'nyan mahâgranthârtham.

[9] This first 5 of the preceding ten *ajjh.* are doubtless meant by this statement. At least in the *Nandî* they preserve the same order of succession.

[10] These texts may be concealed, *i.e.*, absorbed by larger texts—a conjecture which is very probable *e.g.* in the case of the *vivâhachûliyâ*. See above.

[11] cf. *Kup.* 794 (4), where the words "in connection with Ayyarakkhia and Pûsamitta" belong to the last line after Gotthâmâhila; see Âv. N. 8. 89.

[12*] The Jain records on the above seven schisms have been translated into German by Leumann, Ind. Stud. XVII., p. 91-135.—L.

[13] In N, we read *jîvâ ajîvâ jîvâj.* at the beginning: then follows *lôê alôê lôyâlôê*; and *sasamaê p. sasamayaparasamaê* forms the conclusion, (as also in the case of *aṅgas* 4 *et seq.*); the verb is *ṭhâvijjaṁti* in each one of the nine cases—i.e. in the plural.

ya samudda-sûra-bhavaṇa-vimâṇa-âgaraṇadîô nidhayô purisajâyâ[14] sarâ[15] ya gottâ ya jôisaṁvûlâ[16]; êkaviham vattavvayam duviham *jîva* dasaviham vattavvayam jîvâṇa pôggalâṇa ya lôgaṭṭhâim cha ṇam parûvaṇayâ âghavijjaï.[17]

The **commentary** is by Abhayadêva, who both here at the end and elsewhere is frequently called *navâṅgîvṛittikâraḥ*. Commentaries to *aṅgas* 3—11 are ascribed to him; and we have one from his hand on *upâṅga* 1.

He calls himself a scholar of Jinêśvarâchârya[18] and of Buddhisâgara the younger [277] brother of the former. The present commentary was prepared by him *Saṁvat* 1120 (A.D. 1064) in *Aṇahillapâṭaka* with the help of Yaśôdêvagaṇi, a scholar of *Ajitasiṁhâchârya*, for a *paṇḍita-parshad*, conducted by śrî Drôṇâchârya. According to Dharmasâgara's *Gurvâvali*, the "*navâṁgavṛittikṛit*," Abhayadêva died *Saṁvat* 1135, according to others 1139. See Kl. 248b. 253b. (12.30).

IV. The fourth aṅgam, samavâya, "association, group, rubric," in one *ajjhayaṇa*, that consists of very heterogeneous parts. The contents of the first two-thirds is in general the same as that of the third *aṅga*, both being designed for instruction in the eighth year. See above. There is however the difference that the categories here exceed 10,[19] and continue by progression up to 100,[20] and then *per saltus* far exceed 100. Immediately following, but without any logical connection with this, is a detailed table of contents and extent of all the twelve *aṅgas*; then all sorts of statements which cannot be united into one class and which deal partly with doctrine, partly with hagiology and, if we may use the expression, history or legend. This third part is without doubt to be regarded as an appendix to the first part, and the whole as a supplement to the third *aṅga*; as in fact we learn from § 57 that *aṅgas* 1 to 3 were regarded as a connected unit. We have here a compendium of everything worth knowing, [278] a perfect treasure-house of the most important information which is of the greatest value for our understanding of the *Siddhânta*. Of especial significance are, in the first place, the statements of literary and historical content in § 1—100, in reference to the extent and division of the separate *aṅgas*, etc., (statements which were doubtless the principal cause of the addition of the full treatment of this subject); the mention of various celebrated Arhats of the past[21] together with the number of their scholars (this was the cause of the addition of the concluding part); and the frequent reference to the lunar and *nakshatra* computation of time and to the quinquennial *yugam*. The references to the *yugam* are exactly in the manner of the *jyôtisha vêdâṅga*, Kṛittikâ, etc., being the beginning of the series of the *nakshatras*.

Aṅga 4 begins, after prefacing the customary introduction (*suyam mê âusaṁ, têṇaṁ bhagavamtêṇam êvam akkhâyaṁ*) with a fresh statement in reference to the authorship of Mahâvîra:—*iha khalu samaṇêṇaṁ bhagavayâ Mahâvîrêṇaṁ* (then follows the regular *varṇaka* with about 40 attributes, among which are *Jiṇêṇaṁ . . buddhêṇaṁ bohaêṇaṁ . . . .*) *imê duvâlasaṅgê gaṇipiḍagê*[22] *pannattê, taṁ jahâ:* (then follow the names of the 12 *aṅgas*)[23] [279]

[14] Purisajâya tti purushaprakâra unnatapraṇatâdilibhêdaḥ: pâṭhântarêṇa: pussajôga tti upalakshanatvât pushyâdinakshatrâṇâṁ chaṁdrêṇa saha paśchimâgriṁôbhayapramâdâdikô yôgaḥ.

[15] svarâś cha shadjâdayô. [16] °*chûlâ B C*; *jyôtishaḥ târâṛûpasaṁvâlanâni* (*cûl*°?).

[17] N. has instead of ṭhâṇê ṇaṁ davva° the following: ṭaṁkâ kûḍâ sêlâ siharinô pabbhârâ kuṁḍâiṁ guhâô âgarâ dahâ naîô âghavijjaṁti; ṭhâṇê ṇaṁ âgâyâê âguttariyâê vuḍḍhîê dasaṭṭhâṇavivâḍḍhiyâṇaṁ bhâvâṇaṁ parûvaṇâ âghavijjaṁti.

[18] The founder of the *Kharataragachchha*; see the *paṭṭâvali* at the end of the *Sabdaprabhêdaṭîkâ* v. 2 (ms. or. fol. 813), and *Kl.* 248a (11).

[19] In § 1—10 there are many statements which recur in the same form in *aṅga* 3.

[20] They are counted up to 100 as first, second, third *samavâya* (or in the neuter *samavâyam*) up to the hundredth.

[21] *e.g.* Kuṁthu § 27. 81, Kuṁthu § 95, Pâsa § 88. 70, 350. Paṇami (Nami B.C) § 39, Ariṭṭhanêmi § 40, Nami § 41, Vimala § 44. 56, Muṇisuvvaa § 50, Malli § 55. 57, Usabhâ Kôsalia § 63. 83. 89. Môriyaputta § 65, Suvihi Pupphadanta § 75. 86, Bharaha § 77, Seyyasa § 80, Sîyalâsa § 84, Sîyala § 83. 90, Maṁdiyaputta § 83, Supâsa § 86, 95. 200, Ajjiya 90, Iṁdabhûti § 92, Caṁdappaha § 93, Saṁti § 93, Sumaî § 300, Sambhava § 400, Ajia § 450, Sagara 450, Vâsupujja § 700.

[22] This word, which in § 57 is used especially for *aṅgas* 1—3, belongs of course to the tipiṭaka of the Pâli texts, but has no reference to the number three. The designation of "basket" inclines one to think of its having been committed to writing. On the first mention of the name tipiṭaka see *Ind. Stud.* 5, 26; *Vorles. Ind. Lit.-G.*[2] 311, appendix, page 15.

[23] All of the preceding from *iha khalu* on gives an impression of secondary origin. This is the first occasion that we meet with the *varṇaka* of Mahâvîra.

tuttha ṇaṁ jê sê cauttthê aṅgê samavâê ti âhiê,[24] *tassa, ṇaṁ ayam aṭṭhê . . .* In *aṅgas* 1—3 we do not find at the outset any such designation as first, second, third *aṅgam*.

I extract the following from the remainder of the *aṅga*. In § 1 repetition of the statements of the third *aṅga* in reference to the asterisms *addâ*, *chittâ*, *sâti* being called *êgatâra*; further on the same statements are made about the remaining **nakshatras**; in § 7 the 28 *nakshatras* are divided into four groups, viz.: *kittiyâiya* (°*âdika*) in the East (*puvvadâriyâ*), *mahâiya* in the South, *aṇurâ hâiya* in the West, *dhaṇiṭṭhâiyâ* in the North. After[25] the sentence *kittiyâiyâiyâ satta nakkhattâ puvvadâriyâ paṁ* (*pannattâ*) the words *pâṭhâṁtarêṇa abhahiyâdiyâ* (A, *abhiyâiyâ* BC) are inserted ;[26] whereby, as the schol. explains, *abhijit*, *aśvini*, *pushya*, *svâti* are indicated rather than the names in question. This insertion purposes to put the series of *nakshatras*, first invented by the Jains and taught especially in *upâṅgas* 5, 7 (see *Ind. Stud.* 10, 220, 304) in the place of the old *kṛittikâ* series, which still maintained its validity at the time the fourth *aṅga* was first composed.[27] The new view had not yet received the authoritative stamp of orthodoxy. [280] We must however here notice that (cf. p. 269) in the third *aṅga* § 7 we find statements completely identical with those in this insertion.—In § 18 enumeration of the **18 kinds of writing** usual for the bambhî livî (but not so correct as in *up.* 4 on which account I cite them there) ;—§ 18 **atthinatthipavâyassa puvvassa** (this is the fourth *pûrvam*) *aṭṭhârasa vatthû* ;—in § 19 enumeration of the 19 **nâya***jjhayaṇas*, i. e. of the 19 books of *aṅga* 6, in *kârikâ* form ; —in § 23 enumeration of the 23 **sûyagaḍa***jjhayaṇas*, i. e. of those of *aṅga* 2 ;—in § 25 enumeration of the 25 *ajjh.* of *aṅga* 1 ; **âyârassa** *bhagavaô sachâliyâyassa*, the *mahâparinnâ* being mentioned in the ninth place and the *nisîhajjhayaṇa* being designated outright as "25th *ajjh.*" The latter is probably the *chûliyâ* (see § 57 and p. 254) ; the designation as *bhagavant* is found also in § 85, cf. also § 84 ;—in § 36 enumeration of the 36 *ajjh.* of the **uttarajjhayaṇa**, *i.e.* of the first *mûlasûtra*, and in fact with a few insignificant variations of the names given here ; see below—§ 43 *têyâlîsaṁ* **kammavivâga***jjhayaṇâ paṁ*(*nattâ*); the names are however not enumerated ; accord. to the schol. the 20 *ajjh.* of the eleventh *aṅga*, called *vivâgasuya* are hereby referred to, as also the 23 of the second (!) *aṅga*. Cf. page 270 in reference to the kammavivâgadasâu in ten *ajjh.* mentioned in *aṅga* 3, 10; — § 44 *chêyâlîsaṁ ajjhayaṇâ* **isibhâsiyâ** *dêvalôgachuyabhâsiyâ paṁ*(*nattâ*) ; both of these texts, at least under these names, are no longer extant,[28*] I have found the *dêvalôgachuyabhâsiyâ* mentioned in this place alone; the *isibhâsiyâ* however are often mentioned. We have already come across them (see p. 272) in *aṅga* 3, 10 as third *ajjh.* of *aṅga* 10 (!) [281] In the *Nandî* they appear among the *aṇaṅgapaviṭṭha* texts ; the author of the *Âvaśy. nijj.* confesses that he (2, 6) is author of a *nijj.* to the *isibhâsiâi* too, and (8, 54), placing them in the second place, describes them together with *kâliasua*, *sûrapannatti* and *diṭṭhivâa* as the four kinds of *aṇuôa* (see p. 258); *Abhay.* however here characterizes them as *kâlikaśrutaviśêshabhûtâni*. Haribhadra on *Âv.* identifies them, on one occasion (2, 6) with *païnna* 7, on another (8, 54), he calls them *uttarâdhyayanâdîni* ! See above, p. 259. They appear also in connection with the *païnnas*, embracing 50 (!) *ajjh.* in the *Vidhiprapâ*, where their connection with the *Uttarajjhayaṇa* as *matâṁtara* is also referred to — § 46 *diṭṭhivâyassa ṇaṁ chhâyâlîsaṁ* **mâuyâpayâ** (*mâṭṛikâpadâni*) *paṁ*(*nattâ*) ; *baṁbhîê ṇaṁ livîê chhâyâlîsaṁ mâuarakkhâ* (*mâurakarâ* BC, perhaps *mâuakkharâ ? mâṭṛi* + *aksh*°) *paṁ*. In reference to the 46 *mâuyâpayâ* of *aṅga* 12 see below. By the "*lêkhyavidhau* 46 *mâṭṛikâksharâṇi*" of the Scriptures, are according to the schol., to be understood[29] *a* to *ha*, with the addition of *ksha*, but with the

---

[24] *âkhyâta*, I assumed several years ago (see *Bhag.* 1. 410. 2. 251) under the erroneous belief that this form belonged especially to the Sûryaprajñapti (see *Ind. Stud.* 10, 254) that *âhia âhijjaï* were derived from the root khyâ weakened to *khi*, *hi*. I should now prefer to regard them as a species of retrogressive formation from the common *âhaṁsu* (root ah).

[25] Thus in A ; in BC before. [26] The same case is found § 72.

[27] The schol. however regards the *abhijit* series as *siddhâṁtamatam* : he then adds : *iha* (in the text) *tu matâṁtaram âśritya kṛittikâdîni . . bhaṇitâni ; chaṁdraprajñaptau tu bahutarâṇi matâni darśitâni) (Ind. Stud.* 10, 285).

[28*] See however the last but one asterism note.

[29] The Pâṇiniyâ śikshâ counts 63 or 64 varṇas and (as is very remarkable) "both for Sanskṛit and for Prâkṛit (!)" See *Ind. Stud.* 4, 348, 349.

omission of *jha-ḍa-ṭṛi(ḷ)-ûṁ(ṁ)-la (ḷ)* [30] These statements are of the most remarkable character. The number of 46 *aksharas*, whether written signs or sounds (which can have reference to *Sanskṛit* alone and not to *Prâkṛit*, since *ksh* is included in the list), I am as yet entirely unable to explain[31]— § 57 *tiṇhaṁ gaṇipiḍagâṇaṁ âyârachûliyavajjâṇaṁ sattâvannam ajjhayaṇâ paṁ (nattâ) âyârê* 24, *sûyagaḍê* 23, *ṭhâṇê* [282] 10; here the first 3 *aṅgas* are taken together as a unit and called 'the three *gaṇipiḍagas*' *par excellence*. It is here worthy of note that only 24 *ajjh.* are ascribed to the *âyâra* after the separation of the *âyârachûliyâ*, and in fact (p. 254) only the *nisîhajjhayaṇam*, which in § 25 is called the 25th *ajjh.*, can be meant by *âyârachûliyâ*;—in § 59 fifty-nine day-nights (*râtiṁdiya*) are allotted to each season of the lunar year; § 61 *paṁchasaṁvachchharassa ṇaṁ jugassa ridumâsêṇaṁ miyyamâṇassa êgasaṭṭhi udumâsâ paṁ(nâttâ)*; see on this *Jyôtisha* v. 31 (my treatise, p. 93);—§ 62 the quinquennial *yugam* has 62 full moons, 62 new moons; — § 67 67 *nakkhattamâsâ*; according to § 71, the winter of the fourth lunar year (in the *yuga*) has 71 *rvχθήμερα—chaüttha ssa ṇaṁ chaṁdasaṁvachchharassa hêmaṁtâ ṇam êkusattarîê râtiṁdiyêhiṁ vîtikkaṁtêhiṁ*;—in § 72 enumeration of the 72 kalâs which are essentially identical with those which recur in *aṅga* 6, 1, 119, *upâṅga* 1, 107 and elsewhere;[32] the repeated use of the word *lakkhaṇa* probably forms a literary synchronism with the *Mahâbhâshya* and the *Atharvapariśishṭas*. See *Ind. Stud.* 13, 460 Burnell, *Tanjore Catalogue*, p. 9 fg.; the names are:—

Lêhaṁ 1, gaṇiyaṁ 2, rûvaṁ 3, naṭṭaṁ 4, gîyaṁ 5, vâiyaṁ 6, saragayaṁ 7, pukkharagayaṁ 8, samatâlaṁ 9, jûyaṁ 10, jaṇavâyaṁ 11, pôrêvachchaṁ (A, kavvaṁ B.C.)[33] 12, aṭṭhâvayaṁ 13, dagamaṭṭiyaṁ 14, annavihiṁ 15, pâṇavihiṁ 16, lêṇav.[34] 17, sayaṇav. 18, ajjapahêliyaṁ (ajjaṁ pa° BC) 19, mâgahiyaṁ 20, gâhaṁ[35] 21, silôgaṁ 22, gaṁdhajuttiṁ 23, [283] madhusitthaṁ 24,[36] âbharaṇavihiṁ 25, taruṇîpaḍikammaṁ 26, itthîlakkhaṇaṁ 27, purisal. 28, hayal. 29, gayal. 30, gôṇal.[37] 31, kukkuḍal. 32, miḍhayal. 33, chakkal. 34,[38] chhattal. 35, daṁḍal 36, asil. 37, maṇil 38, kâgaṇil. 39, chammal. 40,[39] chaṁdayal. 41, sûrachariyaṁ 42, râhuchariyaṁ 43, gahachariyaṁ[40], 44, sôbhâkaraṁ 45, dôbhâkaraṁ 46, vijjâgayaṁ 47, maṁtag. 48, rahassag. 49, saṁbhâvaṁ 50, vâraṁ (? châraṁ BC) 51, paḍivâraṁ (châraṁ BC) 52,[41] bûhaṁ 53, paḍibûhaṁ 54, khaṁdhâvâramâṇaṁ 55, nagaramâṇaṁ 56, vatthumâṇaṁ 57, khaṁdhâvâranivêsaṁ 58, nagaranivêsaṁ 59, vatthunivêsaṁ 60, îsatthaṁ 61, chharuppavâyaṁ (pagayaṁ BC) 62, âsasikkhaṁ 63, hatthisikkhaṁ 64, dhaṇuvêdaṁ 65, hariṇavâdaṁ (hiraṇṇavâyaṁ BC) 66, suvaṇṇavâdaṁ 67, maṇipâgaṁ 68, dhâṇupâgaṁ 69, bâhujuddhaṁ 70, daṁḍaj. 71, muṭṭhij. 72, aṭṭhij. 73, juddhaṁ 74, nijuddhaṁ 75, juddhâtijuddhaṁ 76, suttakheḍḍaṁ 77, ṇâliyâkheḍḍaṁ 78, vaṭṭakheḍḍaṁ 79, dhammakheḍḍaṁ[42] 80, chamharevaṭṭaṁ (! pamhakheḍḍaṁ BC) 81, pattachheyyaṁ 82, kaḍaga(kaṇṇaga BC)chheyyaṁ 83, pattagachheyyaṁ 84, sajîvaṁ 85, nijîvaṁ 86, saûṇaruyam 87 iti. Of these 87 names, 15 are to be removed, whether they are *pâṭhâṁtaras* (see on No. 80) or interpolations. For the v. r. from *Nây.* see below;—§ 81 *vivâhapannattîê* (in the fifth *aṅga*) *êkkâsîiṁ mahâjummasayâ* [284] (*mahâyugmaśatâni*) *paṁ(nattâ)*;— § 84 *vivâhapannattîês ṇaṁ bhagavaîê chaürâsîiṁ payasa-*

[30] Among the Brahmans too there is found an enumeration of the alphabet in order to form a diagram. Cf. my treatise on the Râma Tâp. Up. I. 62, p. 309. This enumeration contains 51 *aksharas* (16 vowels, 35 consonants), which, after deducting 5 *aksharas*, shows the 46 *mâtṛyakkharâ* ascribed in *aṅga* 4, 46 to the *baṁbhî livî*. In reference to their use see page 462. It is however doubtful whether the use of the latter (on page 462) represents an example of the mâtṛyakkharâ.

[31] *tâni châ 'kârâdîni hakârâṁtâni* (°râṁtâni) *saksha kârâni jha-ḍa-ṭṛi-ûṁ-laṁ(!)*. (Leumann proposes to me to read *ṛi, ṛî, ḷi*; but what is the meaning of *jha* and *ḍa*!) *ty eva* (!) *ity êtadaksharapaṁchakavarjitâni saṁbhâvyaṁtê*.—The letters meant are indeed *ṛi, ṛî, ḷi, ḷî* and *ṁ*, see Weber's Cat. II., p. 408, n. 2.—L.

[32] See Paul Steinthal, Specimen of the Nâyâdh. p. 20 and Leumann Aupapât. p. 77, where especial notice is taken of the variant readings here.

[33] *Nay.* has here *pâsayam* and reverses the position of 12 and 13.—*The right name of the 12th *kalâ* is no doubt *pôrêkachchaṁ-pauraskṛtyaṁ*.—L.

[34] *Vilêvaṇa Nây.* with the addition of *vatthav.* [35] *Nây.* adds *gîtiyaṁ*.

[36] Instead of 23. 24 *Nây.* has *hiraṇṇajuttiṁ, suvaṇṇaj. chuṁṇaj.* [37] Steinthal has gaṇal°.

[38] Nây. omits 33, 34. [39] 40—50 omitted in Nây.

[40] Are they to be regarded as planets or are they to be understood according to the fashion of the Ath. Pariś. 53. 54?

[41] Instead of 51-57 there are in *Nây.* the following 31 names; *vatthuvijjaṁ, khaṁdhâramâṇaṁ* 56. 53. 54, 51 (BC), 52 (BC) *chakkavûhaṁ, garulavûhaṁ, sagadavûhaṁ*, 74—76. 73. 72. 70, *layâjuddhaṁ*, 61. 62. 65—67. 77°79. 78. 81. 82. 85—87.

[42] Omitted in BC, where we read instead *pâvaṁtarê* (*pâṭhâṁtarê*) *chamha°*, by which chamha° is manifestly designated as v. l. to *pamha°*.

hassâ padaggêṇaṁ pannattâ. Later on in the course of our investigation we will recur to the fact that this statement in reference to the extent of the text is less by 100,000 *padas* than that of the present text. See § 85 and § 25 on the designation as *bhagavatî*, which has remained the exclusive property of this text.—§ 85 **âyârassa** *ṇaṁ bhagavatô sachûliyâgassa paṁchâsîiṁ uddêsaṇakâlâ*; — § 88 **diṭṭhivâyassa** *ṇaṁ aṭṭhâsîiṁ suttâiṁ paṁ taṁ: ujjusuyaṁ, pariṇayâpariṇayaṁ, êvaṁ-aṭṭhâsîiṁ suttâṇi bhâṇiyavvâṇi jahâ Nandîê.* This reference to the *Nandî*, by which any further enumeration has been spared, is very remarkable from the fact that the statements in it, a few pages further on, are found in exactly the same detail in the fourth *aṅga* itself at this very point, in the consideration of the contents and extent of all the *aṅgas*. This being the case the reference ought to have followed the collective statement found several pages further on in the same *aṅga*. We are therefore compelled to believe that the *Nandî* is the original source of information for this presentation, common to *aṅga* 4 and the *Nandî*, and that this presentation was at a later period taken from the *Nandî* and inserted in *aṅga* 4; furthermore, this insertion must have occurred at a period succeeding that to which the above reference of the redactor belongs. Or have we merely to do with a later act of the scribes? Were this the case, this act of theirs is at least very remarkable, if not unfortunately executed. There is, however, one difficulty in the way of the assumption that the *Nandî* is the ultimate source, viz.:—there are all manner of differences between the treatment in the *Nandî* and that here, differences in which the *Nandî* does not always [285] contain the more ancient statements. See below. The fact that the table of contents in N. is much shorter than that here makes, it is true, *eo ipso*, an impression of greater antiquity; and N. offers in this table of contents many readings which are decidedly older and better.

We have now reached a point where we may discuss the **collective presentation** itself. It begins simply: *duvâlasaṁgê gaṇipiḍagê paṁ(natthê), taṁ*: . . then follow the names of the 12 *aṅgas* and then the details in reference to contents, division and extent of each of the twelve. I insert here what I have collected from the statements in reference to division and extent, that the reader may obtain a general survey of the whole. I subjoin the v. r. from the *Nandî* (N) which, after what I have said above, may in the last instance claim priority over those of the *aṅga*.

1. **âyârê**, 2 suyakhaṁdhâ, 25 ajjhayaṇâ, 85 uddêsaṇakâlâ, 85 samuddêsaṇakâlâ, 18 payasahassâiṁ payaggêṇaṁ.

2. **sûyagaḍê**, 2 suyakh. 23 ajjh., 33 udd., 33 samudd., 36 padasahassâiṁ (36,000) padaggêṇaṁ.

3. **ṭhâṇê**, 1 suyakh., 10 ajjh., 21 udd., 21 samudd., 72 payasahassâiṁ (72,000) payaggêṇaṁ.

4. **samavâê**, 1 ajjh., 1 suyakh., 1 udd., 1 samudd., êgê chôyâlê payasayasahassê (144,000; *saya* is omitted in the incorrect Berlin MS. of N, but accord. to Leumann is in the N Ed.) pay.

5. **viyâhe**, 1 suy., 100 ajjh. with a residue (! êgê sâirêgê ajjhayaṇasayê), 10 uddêsagasahassâiṁ, 10 samuddêsagasahassâiṁ, 36 vâgaraṇasahassâiṁ, 84 (!) payasahassâiṁ (84,000) pâyaggêṇaṁ:—the latter statement is found also in § 84—see above page 284—N, however, has: do lakkhâ aṭṭhâsîi (288,000) payasahassâiṁ, which corresponds to twice the former steady increase in 1—4.

6. [286] **nâyâdhammakahâu**, 2 suyakh., 19 (A N Edit., 29 BCN) ajjh.[43] 10 dhammakahâṇaṁ vaggâ (this omitted in N), 19 (A N Ed., 29 BCN) uddêsaṇakâlâ, 19 (A N Ed., 29 BN) samuddêsaṇakâlâ, saṁkhêjjâiṁ payasayasahassâiṁ p. (saya omitted in N., also in Ed.; 576,000 Schol.)—Between 10 dh. vaggâ and 19 (or 29) udd. we find inserted: in each dhammakahâ 500 akkhâiyâ, in each akkhâiyâ 500 uvakkhâiyâ, in each uvakkhâiyâ 500 akkhâiyâ-uvakkhâiyâ, in all 3½ akkhaiyakôḍîô.[44] In N this statement from dasadhammakahâṇaṁ vaggâ (inclusive) on, is at an earlier place in the description of the contents.

7. **uvâsagadasâô**, 1 suyakh., 10 ajjh., 10 udd. kâlâ, 10 samud°lâ, saṁkhêjjâi payas ayasahassâiṁ p. (saya omitted in N, also in Ed.; 1,152,000 Schol.).

---

[43] êgûṇavîsaṁ A N Ed., êkônavîsâti Schol. (also on N), êgûṇattîsaṁ BCN.

[44] Cf. my remarks on *aṅga* 6 in reference to this remarkable number. We are lead to expect a much higher figure. N Ed. has kahâṇagakô° accord. to Leumann instead of akkhâiyakôḍîô.

8. **aṁtagaḍadasâô**, 1 suyakh., 10 ajjh. (N omits), 7 (8 N) vaggâ, 10 (8 N) ud°lâ, 10 (8 N) samud°lâ, saṁkhêjjâiṁ payasayasahassâiṁ p. (saya omitted in N, also in Ed.; 2,304,000 Schol.).

9. **aṇuttarôvavâiyadasâô**, 1 suyakh., 10 ajjh. (omitted in N Ed.), 3 vaggâ, 10 (3 N) udd°lâ, 10 (3 N) sam°lâ, saṁkhêjjâiṁ payasayasahassâiṁ p. (saya omitted in N, also in Ed.; 4,608,000 Schol.).

10. **paṇhâvâgaraṇâṇi**, 1 suyakh., [45 ajjh. N], 45 udd°lâ, 45 samudd°lâ, saṁkhêjjâṇi payasayasahassâṇi p. (saya omitted in N, also in Ed.; 9,216,000 Schol.).[45]

11. **vivâyasuê**, [2 suyakh. N], 20 ajjh., 20 udd°lâ, 20 samu°lâ, saṁkhêjjâiṁ payasayasahassâiṁ p. (saya omitted in AN, also in Ed.; 18,432,000 Schol.)[46]

12. [287] **diṭṭhivâê**, 1 suyakh., 14 puvvâiṁ, saṁkhijjâ vatthû, saṁkhejjâ chûla (chulla N) vatthû, saṁkhejjâ pâhuḍâ, s. pâhuḍapâhuḍâ, saṁkhejjâu pâhuḍiyâu, saṁkhejjâu pâhuḍiyapâhuḍiyâu, saṁkhejjâṇi payasahassâṇi.

The most remarkable feature of the above is the statement in reference to the number of the words of each *aṅga*. According to Abhayadêva in the scholia,[47] the number of words in the case of *aṅgas* 1—4, increases continually by half till the eleventh *aṅga* is reached; and the *Nandi* and an anonymous writer thereupon asserts the same with the modification that, instead of *aṅgas* 1—4, aṅgas 1—5 are said to show this increase. This view is however in direct opposition to the actual facts of the case, for *aṅgas* 7—11 are the least of all as regards their extent; which is so very small that there can be no thought of "100,000[48] countable *padas*,"[49] "countable" meaning here probably "those that need a special count," "numerous" or "innumerable." If we reckon on the average for each *padam* three *âksharas*[50] and for each *grantha* (*śloka* i.e. 32 *aksh.*), twelve padas, the following is the result of a comparison of the number of these *granthas*, stated[51] as in the MSS., with the above *pada* numbers [288].

1. aṅga,	2554 gr.,	i. e.	30,648 padas,	instead	of 18,000 p.[52a]
2. - ,	2300 gr.,		27,600 padas,	,,	36,000
3. - ,	3750 gr.,		45,000 padas,	,,	72,000
4. - ,	1607 gr.,		19,284 padas,	,,	144,000
5. - ,	15,750 gr.,		189,000 padas,	,,	84,000
				or	(288,000 N
6. - ,	5,375 gr.,[53]		64,500 padas,	,,	576,000
7. - ,	812 gr.,		9,744 padas,	,,	[1,152,000]
8. - ,	890 gr.,		10,680 padas,	,,	[2,304,000]
9. - ,	192 gr.,		2,304 padas,	,,	[4,608,000]
10. - ,	1300 gr.,		15,672 padas,	,,	[9,216,000]
11. - ,	1316 gr.,		15,792 padas,	,,	[18,432,000]

[45] Dvinavatir lakshâh shôḍasasahasrâdhikâḥ.

[46] êkâ padakôtis chaturaśîtir lakshâḥ dvâtriṁśac cha sahasrâni.

[47] Lakewise also Nêmichandra in the Pravachanasâroddhâra § 92 v. 726: paḍhamaṁ âyâramgaṁ aṭṭhârasasahassapayapariṁâṇaṁ | êvaṁ sêsaṁgâṇa vi dugunâ dugunappamâṇaṁ ||

[48] N at least has only "thousands."

[49] Accord. to Leumann *saṁkhejja* signifies merely an indefinite number that is still to be counted, and not always a large number.

[50] See *Bhagav.* 1, 377. This is true in the case of the prose; in verse we must reduce the number somewhat. The preliminary question is of course—What does the author understand by *pada*? [*Malayagiri* in the *Nandiṭîkâ* says p. 425 *yatrârthôpalabdhis tat padam.*—L.] In this approximation of three *aksharas* to a *pada* I have reckoned the single members of compounds as a single word, in so far as the compounds can lay claim to be considered as such.

[51] See above, p. 250. The grantha enumeration is of secondary origin in comparison with the pada enumeration.

[52a] So also in *niśîthabhâshya pedh.* 1 (taken from the Achâra-niry.). It must, however, be noted that the above number (18,000) *is referred to the first Śrutaskandha only. Malayagiri* says [Nandi-ṭîkâ, p. 425]: atra para âha yath'Âchârê dvau śrutaskandhau pañchaviṁśatir adhyayanâni padâgrêṇa châshṭâdaśa pada-sahasrâṇi tarhi yad bhaṇitaṁ *nava baṁbhachêramaiô aṭṭhârasa paya-sahassaô vêô tti* tad virudhyatê; atra hi navabrahmacharyâdhyayana-mâtra êvâshṭâdaśa-padasahasra-pramâṇa Âchâra uktô, 'smiṁs tv adhyayanê dvau śrutaskandhau pañchaviṁśatir adhyayanâni êtat samagrasy' Âchârasya parimânam uktaṁ, ashṭâdaśa pada-sahasrâṇi punaḥ prathama-śrutaskandhasya navabrahmacharyâdhyayanasya. vichitrârtha-nibaddhâni hi sûtrâṇi bhavanti, ata êva chaishâṁ samyagarthâvagamô gurûpadêśâṭô bhavati nânyathâ, âha cha *chûrṇikṛit*: *âô suyakkhandhâ panavîsaṁ aṇhayaṇâṇi, êyaṁ âyâragâsahiyassa (?) Âyârassa pamâṇaṁ bhaṇiyaṁ; aṭṭhârasa paya-sahassâ puṇa padhama-suyakkhandhassa navabaṁbhachêramayassa pamâṇaṁ; vichitta-attha-nibaddhâṇi ya suttâṇi, gurûvaêsaô êsaṁ aṭṭhô jâṇiyavvo tti.* This view of the *Chûrṇikṛit* (translated by Malayagiri into Sanskrit) seems to be all the more right as the Digambaras ascribe also 18,000 padas to the *Âchâra* without acknowledging any second Śrutaskandha, see Prof. Peterson's Second Report, p. 134.—L.

[53] Another statement 5,500 gr., or 4,155 gr.

In the case of *aṅgas* 1 and 5, the numbers above given are less, in the case of all the others, greater than the actual state of the case. In a majority of cases the difference is simply ridiculous. The statement in reference to *aṅga* 5 (84,000)[54] is not in harmony with the increase in 1—4 i.e. twice the number of the previous. We should expect that *aṅga* 5 should have preserved the same ratio, as is the case in N. This statement is in direct contradiction to those statements which are found in the MSS. of *aṅga* 5; according to which its extent is not 84,000 (and not 288,000, as is stated in N) but 184,000 padas (*Bhag.* 1, 377), which corresponds well enough to its actual extent: 15,750 *gr.* = 189,000 *padas*. The peculiar nature of our statement in reference [289] to 84,000 *padas* is, finally, rendered more apparent by the fact that it is found in § 84 of the first part of our *aṅga*, on the strength of which it has again found a place here.[55] In that § it is so free from suspicion that I consider it correct for that period, and find in this very circumstance a critical criterion or testimony that, at that time, the fifth *aṅga* had not yet reached its present extent.

As peculiar as the statements in reference to numbers of padas are those concerning the '3½ *koṭi*" i. e. 35 millions, in *aṅga* 6. That all this is perfect nonsense, is perfectly apparent. See below. Finally there are several differences of a very surprising nature in the other statements which are not so readily set aside as incorrect or impossible, differences which exist partly in these statements themselves, partly in their relation to the actual facts. First, the difference in reference to the number of *ajjhayaṇas* in *aṅga* 6; according to A and Abhayad. there are 19 and such is the actual state of the case—but according to BCN[56*] there are 29. Then as regards *aṅga* 8 the 10 *ajjh.* are wanting in N.[57] The number of the *vaggas* (7), of the *udd.* (10) and of the *samudd.* (10) is in N everywhere 8; likewise as regards *aṅga* 9 N has the number 3 as in the case of the *vaggas*, and in that of the *udd.* and *samudd.*; in the case of *aṅga* 10 N adds 45 *ajjh.* and in that of *aṅga* 11 likewise 2 *suyakh.* In reference then [290] to the actual facts, we must make the preliminary observation that the division into *uddêsagas* in the case of *aṅgas* 8—11, and that into *samuddêsagas* in general in all the *aṅgas*, is not denoted in the MSS.[58*] The other differences refer chiefly to the fifth *aṅgam* which has no division into *ajjhayaṇas*; in that *aṅga* they are called *saya* (*śata*), and their number is not 100 but 41 or, including the sub-sayas, 138; likewise the existing text has only 1925 (not 10,000) *uddêsagas*. A special demarcation of *vâgaraṇa* sections is unknown.[59] What can possibly be the meaning of 36,000 *vâgaraṇas* and only 84,000 *padas*! (cf. *Bhag.* 1. 376). The differences in reference to *aṅgas* 8—11 are not less remarkable. As regards the *vaggas* (8), *aṅga* 8 agrees with N, but has, not 10 (cf. *aṅga* 3, 10), but 93 *ajjh.*;—*aṅga* 9 has likewise not 10 (cf. again *aṅga* 3, 10), but 33 *ajjh.*;—*aṅga* 10 has ten *dâras*; cf. the ten *ajjh.* in *aṅga* 3, 10, whereas we have here no information about *dâras* or *ajjh.*, and N, on the other hand, speaks of 45 *ajjh.*—*aṅga* 11 has in agreement with N the 2 *suyakh.*, which are not mentioned in the source of information before us. In the case of *aṅga* 12 there is no possibility of comparing the statements in question with the text, since there is no longer any such extant.—See below.[60]

---

[54] Or *sarva-milanêna* 1841 (v. l. 1894) granthas!

[55] So also Abhayadêva, who shows that he is evidently embarrassed in his statement: chaturaśîtipadasahasrâṇi padâgrêṇê 'ti samavâyâpêkshayâ ("in reference to § 84") dviguṇatayâ (tâyâ?) iti (?) nâsrayaṇât (?), anyathâ tad dviguṇatvê dvê takadê ashtâśîtiḥ sahasrâṇi cha bhavanti. In the following *aṅga* he states the number of padas to be 576,000 i. e twice that of those in *aṅga* 5, according to his computation.

[56*] According to Leumann Nzd. has 19 and not 29.—Here again, as with aṅga 1, *only the first Śrutaskandha is intended* by the assertion of there being 19 *ajjhayaṇas* and not 29. In the same way only Part I. of aṅga 11 has been known to the author of aṅga 3, 10 as has been shown above on p. 270.—L.

[57] According to Leumann this is not so in Nzd.

[58*] This statement requires some modification; see the closing words of aṅgas 8—10 in Weber's Cat. II., 502 (8). 507 (9). 520 (10: dasasu chêva divaseṣu *uddiśijjanti* . . . .); aṅga 11 has in the place a reference to aṅga 1 (see ibid. 534) which, however, has the same bearing.—L.

[59] This demarcation, or the number 36,000 representing it, is also found in the table of contents of *aṅga* 5 preceding the statements in reference to the extent.

[60] I will note here merely the fact that in the section in reference to the twelfth *aṅgam*, *Bhaddabhu* is mentioned by name, whom tradition proclaims to be the last teacher of this aṅgam or of the fourteen *pûrvas*; see above, p. 214. It is furthermore stated that therein was contained a section in reference to *Bhaddabâhu* and to his history.

The question now arises how are these differences to find a fitting solution? It is self-evident, that, so far as the extraordinary character [291] both of our information in regard to the number of padas, and of the *akkhâias* in *aṅga* 6 is concerned, they are a fabrication of the author; nor is it improbable that a similar explanation may hold good in the case of the special differences of detail. The carefulness of statement which we notice here, renders it, on the other hand, possible that the author has based his statements on those of his authorities, and that we have to deal with genuine discrepancies between two different texts. Abhayadêva declares here that he is unable to explain the contradiction[61] in the case of *aṅgas* 8 and 9 and in the case of *aṅga* 10 all that he does is to admit the existence of the conflict.[62] But in his commentary on *aṅga* 10 he adduces (1) a further case of divergence—an introduction at variance with the general character of the introductions in that it allots to the *aṅga* two *suyakkhaṁdhas*, and (2) refers especially to the conflict between the *pûrvâchâryâḥ* and the *aidaṁyugînâḥ*. See below. Of primal importance for *aṅgas* 8 to 10 (11) is the fact that the statements in *aṅga* 3, 10 too render it [292] probable, that these *aṅgas* had then a text different from our own. The irreconcilability of title and contents show that in the case of *aṅga* 10 something must have occurred to cause the present condition of affairs.

As we have seen that there are important differences between the statements made here or in N. and the actual state of things in the eleven *aṅgas*, so far as **extent** and **division** are concerned, we now discover that the same holds good as regards the statements, now under examination, concerning the **contents**. These statements, which in N are much more brief than those in *aṅga* 4, are, it must be said, of so general a character and so colourless that their real contents can only be discovered with difficulty. They appear in a form that is purely stereotyped (see the common introduction in *aṅgas* 2 to 5,[63] and in 6—9 and 11,[64]) whereas there is no such similarity of contents between each of the single members of these two groups; and the statements in question are not in exact accordance with the contents of any single one. This latter remark holds good in the case of the special statements in reference to the contents of *aṅga* 10, to which we do not find any such stereotyped introduction. These special statements suit the name of the *aṅga*, but not its present contents. It is of great significance that the statements in *aṅga* 3, 10 (see above, p. 272) are essentially in accordance with these now under discussion. This agreement [293] makes it extremely probable that the contents of the tenth *aṅgam*, as it then existed, was in harmony with these statements.

To the detailed consideration of the 12 *aṅgas* there is appended here, as in the *Nandî*, a **passage on the entire duvâlasaṁgaṁ gaṇipiḍagam.** This deals partly with the attacks, which it was subjected to in the past,[65] which it now experiences in the present and will experience in the future, partly with the devoted acquiescence which is its lot to meet with in these three periods and concludes with the declaration of its certain existence for ever: na kayâi na âsi, na kayâi na 'tthi, na kayâi na bhavissati.

The **concluding portion** of the fourth *aṅga* consists of frequent reference to the legendary hagiology and history of the Jains, genealogical enumerations (and others of different content) of parents, wives, etc. of the *kulakaras*, 24 *titthakaras*, 12 *chakkavaṭṭis*, 9 Baladêvas, 9 Dasâras, 9 Vâsudêvas, partly in metrical form (*śloka* and *âryâ*). Towards the end there is a transition to prophecy (construction in the future). Our information here varies in part very materially from that contained in Hêm. 26 fg. 691 fg. and is not preserved in the MSS. with any

[61] On 8: dasa ajjhayaṇa tti prathamavargâpêkshayai 'va ghaṭatê, Naṁdyâ tathai 'va vyâkhyâtatvât (see below); yathê (yach chê) 'ha pathyatê satta *vaggâ* ti tat parthamavargâd anyavargâpêkshayâ yatô 'tra sarvê 'py ashṭa *vargâ* Naṁdyâm api tathâ pathitâḥ; . . sarvâṇi (adhyayanâni) chai 'kavargagatâni yugapad uddiśyaṁte, atô ('tra) bhaṇitaṁ: aṭṭha uddêsâ ity âdi, iha cha daśô 'ddêsanakâlâ adhîyaṁtê, iti nâ 'syâ 'bhiprâyam adhigachchhâmaḥ;—and on 9: ihâ 'dhyayanasamûhô vargô, daśâ 'dhyayanâni, vargaś cha yugapad êvô 'padiśyatê, ity atas traya êvô 'ddêśanakâlâ bhavaṁty êvam êva cha Naṁdâv adhîyatê, iha tu dṛiśyatê: daśê 'ty, atrâ 'bhiprâyô na jñâyatê.

[62] Yady apî 'ha adhyayanâṇâṁ daśatvâd daśai 'vô 'ddêśanakâlâ bhavaṁti, tathâ 'pi vâchanâṁtarâpêkshayâ (cf. N) paṁchachatvâriṁśad iti saṁbhâvyaṁtê iti paṇayâllîsam ity âdi aviruddhaṁ (!).

[63] Samaya, lôya, jîva.

[64] Nayarâiṁ etc. N limits herein its treatment of the subject entirely to this common introduction and gives nothing else in addition.

[65] According to Abh., attacks at the hands of Jamâli, Goshṭhâmâhila, etc., *i.e.* the representatives of the seven schisms.

great consistency. Hence it appears that our knowledge is not complete, but is derived from accounts of a partial nature which is in need of additional supplementary testimony. Some of the MSS. afford at one time generous information and at another limited data.

The survey of contents of aṅga 4, contained in the detailed account of the *aṅgas*, runs as follows: sê kiṁ taṁ samavâê? samavâê ṇaṁ sasamayâ sûijjaṁti [294] parasamayâ s. *jâva* lôgalôgê sûijjaṁti[66]; samavâêṇaṁ êgâdiyâṇaṁ êgatthâṇaṁ êguttariyaparivaḍḍhiya[67] (duvâlasaṁgassa ya gaṇipiḍagassa pallavaggê samaṇugâijjaï)[68] thâṇagasayassa[69] bârasavihavittharassa[70] suyanâṇassa jagajîvahiyassa[71] bhagavatô samâsêṇaṁ samâyârê[72] âhijjaï; tattha ya nâṇâvihappagârâ jîvâjîvâ ya vanniyâ[73] vittharêṇaṁ, avarê vi ya bahuvihâ visêsâ naraya-tiriya[74]-maṇuyasuragaṇâṇaṁ âhâr'-ussâsa-lêsa-âvâsa-saṁkhâ-âyaya-ppamâṇa-uvavâya-chayaṇa-ogâhaṇ'-ôhi[75]-vêyaṇâvihâṇa-uvaôga[76] jôga-iṁdiya-kasâya,[77a] vivihâ ya jîvajôṇî vikkhaṁbh'-ussêhaparirayappamâṇaṁ vidhivisêsâ[78] ya, Maṁdarâdîṇaṁ mahîdharâṇaṁ, kulagara-titthagara-gaṇaharâṇaṁ samatta Bharahâhivâṇaṁ[79] chakkîṇa chêva chakkahara-halaharâṇa ya, vâsâṇa[80] ya niggamâ[81] samâê, êtê annê ya êvam-âi ettha[82] vittharêṇaṁ atthâ samâsejjaṁti[83]

The commentary is by Abhayadêva.

(To be continued.)

MISCELLANEA.

GUSTAVE GARREZ.

The year 1888 was darkened by the deaths of two great French oriental scholars,—Abel Bergaigne, and Pierre-Gustave Garrez. Neither could be spared, for each was a high authority in his own domain. Bergaigne's Vedic studies were cut short by a tragic accident which occurred while he was still in the active vigour of his maturity, and Garrez's death, as sudden as it was unexpected, has left a void which will be none the less felt, because his modesty prevented his name being widely known beyond the immediate circle of the *Société Asiatique*

A short memoir of the career of the latter, from the pen of M. E. Senart has appeared in the pages of the *Journale Asiatique*, and a brief account of the salient facts of his life will no doubt be acceptable to the readers of the *Indian Antiquary*.

He was born at Rome in the year 1834, was brought up in Paris, and as a young man saw military service in the Crimean war. He left the army in 1857, and abandoned himself to study with that inexhaustible energy, that *labor improbus*, which characterised all that he did, and which resulted in the acquisition of a vast amount of learning of varied kinds. His bent was always towards foreign tongues, and he commenced with German and Italian The perusal of Max Duncker's *Histoire de l'Antiquité* turned his attention to the East, and armed with Benfey's Manual, he commenced, unassisted, the study of Sanskṛit. The range of his studies quickly extended. India led him to Irân, and Irân to the Semitic languages and civilisations of ancient Asia. He studied, in turn, Zend, Persian, Pahlavi, Armenian, Hebrew, Arabic, and Syriac, without allowing the wide extent of his reading to interfere with its depth. In India, too, the boundaries of his researches approached nearer and nearer to the present day, and he made himself master of the Prâkṛits, of the dialectic Sanskṛit of Buddhism, and of the modern languages,—not only those of the Âryan stock, but also the Drâvidian ones, and more especially Tamil

All this time spent in the acquisition of learning gave him little leisure for the production of original compositions. Moreover, never satisfied with anything short of perfection, an unsparing and severe critic, he could not be prevailed upon to publish to others that with which he was not himself entirely satisfied. With such

---

[66] N has instead of sûijjaṁti everywhere samâsijjaṁti and, as in the case of 3, the order jîvâ . ., lôê . ., sasamaê.

[67] parivuḍḍhiya A. [68] pallavâ avayavâs, tatparimâṇaṁ samanugîyatê pratipâdyatê.

[69] N is much better: samavâê ṇaṁ êgâi-êguttariya thâṇassyavivaddhiyâṇaṁ bhâvâṇaṁ parûvaṇâ âghavijjati; duvâlasaṁgassa ga° gassa pallavaggê samâsijjaï, N omits all the following. As the words duvâ° gâijjaï interrupt in *aṅga* 4 the connection, I have enclosed them in brackets.

[70] bârassa° A. [71] jîviyassa hi A. [72] °yârî A. [73] viṇiyâ A; varṇitâḥ.

[74] naragatariya A. [75] uggâhiṇôyahi A; avagâhanâ, avadhi. [76] uvaṁga A B C.

[77a] kasâyâ A B C; prathamâ . . lôpaḥ.—So upâṅga 1, 163 presents *Áraṇa-Achchuyâ tinni ya* (see p. 88, note 6 of my ed. of the text).—L.

[78] viddhasêsa A. [79] samasta Bharatâdhipânâm.

[80] varshâṇâṁ Bharatâdikshêtrânâṁ. [81] °gamâ ya BC. [82] âdi 'ttha A.

[83] So A, samâhijjaṁti BC samâśriyantê, athavâ samâsyamtê.

severe self-criticism, there is the danger of writing too little, and into this danger Garrez fell. His ripe learning, his power for comparative philology, have been lost to the world. His two principal essays, the one on the *Bundelkesh* of Justi (1869) and the other on Weber's *Hâla* (1872), are monuments of erudition. He showed himself able to thread his way with equal ease amid the mazes of Zend and Pahlavî, Arabic and Armenian, Prâkṛit and Sanskṛit, ancient and modern India. His review of Hâla's *Saptaśatikâ* is probably that which is best known in India, and its readers will remember with what sobriety, yet decision, he put forward theories then altogether new, but since in great measure confirmed, regarding the comparatively late development of the classical literature of India, and the previous existence of a literature couched in the popular dialects. Other shorter essays, published in the *Journale Asiatique*, and in the *Revue Critique*, need not be referred to here, though we may direct attention to his luminous criticism (*Rev. Crit.* March 1873) of the first volume of Mr. Beames' Comparative Grammar. The writer of these lines well remembers a pleasant afternoon spent at the rooms of the Société Asiatique in Paris, in the winter of 1886, and how delighted he was with the learning and the originality of some remarks on Hindî put forward by Garrez in the course of an ordinary conversation.

His private means were sufficient to render it unnecessary for him to submit to the drudgery of a professorship, and at the same time prevented his feeling the at times useful spur of necessity. Hence, beyond the range of his intimates, his name was as little known, as his writings were rare.

M. Senart's closing remarks deserve quoting in their original form, — "Cette vie se ferme sans avoir conquis dans le public la réputation legitimement due à tant de travail et de mérite. C'est une tristesse pour les amis de Garrez. Quant à lui, jamais une pareille préoccupation ne l'a effleuré. Il était aussi supérieur à la vanité qu'étranger à l'ambition. Sa noble carrière, toute pleine d'une activité sans agitation, quoique sans repos, gouvernée par une âme haute et sereine, éclairée par un esprit admirablement ferme et étendu, restera inoubliable à ses confrères et à ses amis; elle leur sera, mieux qu'un cher souvenir, un modèle fortifiant. Quelle récompense plus enviable pour un homme qui, avec la patrie, a surtout passionément aimé deux choses; la science et l'amitié?"

G. A. G.

CALCULATIONS OF HINDU DATES.

No. 31.

In the **Tâlgund stone inscription of the time of the Western Châlukya king Jayasiṁha III., from Maisûr**, published by me in this Journal, Vol. IV. p. 278 f. (see also *Pâli, Sanskṛit, and Old-Kanarese Inscriptions*, No. 215), the date (line 8 ff.) is — Śaka-varsha 950neya Vibhava-saṁvatsarada Pushya-śuddha-5-Sômavârad=uttarâyaṇa-saṁkrântiy-andu, — "at the time of the Uttarâyana-Saṁkrânti of Monday,[1] the fifth *tithi* of the bright fortnight of (the month) Pushya (*i.e.* Pausha) of the Vibhava *saṁvatsara*, which is the 950th Śaka year." And the inscription goes on to record that, on this occasion, the Thirty-two-thousand (*Mahâjanas*) of Sthânakundûr, an *agrahâra* that had existed from time immemorial, made a grant of twelve *mâru*s (of land), by the measure of the staff called *gaḍimbada-gaḷe* of the god Praṇamêśvara.

By the southern luni-solar system, **the Vibhava saṁvatsara** coincided with Śaka-Saṁvat 951 current; *i.e.* with the given year 950 as an expired year. In this year **the given tithi, Pausha śukla 5**, began on Sunday, 22nd December, A.D. 1028, at about 56 *ghaṭis*, 42 *palas*, after mean sunrise (for Bombay); **was current all through the Monday**; and ended on the Tuesday, at about 1 *gh.* 7 *p.* And **the Uttarâyaṇa-Saṁkrânti**, as represented by the sun's entrance into Makara, **occurred on the Monday**, at about 37 *gh.* 58 *p.* Accordingly, the English equivalent of the given date is **Monday, 23rd December, A.D. 1028.**

This date gives an instance of the custom to which I have drawn attention at page 260 above, of quoting, as the *tithi* of a *saṁkrânti*, **the tithi that is actually current at the moment of the saṁkrânti.** It is not a very pointed instance; because there was no other *tithi*, current or ended, on the day of this *saṁkrânti*. But there was no absolute necessity for the original to quote the fortnight and *tithi* at all; there are plenty of instances in which these details, and sometimes even the name of the month, are omitted, in connection with a *saṁkrânti*. And therefore this date is an instance of the custom in question; though doubtless we shall obtain more pointed instances hereafter.

In this instance we find that, though the *saṁkrânti* occurred more than three *ghaṭis* after sunset, its **puṇyakâla** was not deferred till the next day, but was taken to be on the day of the occurrence of the *saṁkrânti*.

J. F. FLEET.

[1] Rice (*Mysore Inscriptions*, p. 201) has given 'Sunday;' but this is a mistake; the syllables *sômavâra* are very distinct.

THE SIXTY-YEAR CYCLE OF JUPITER.

In order still further to facilitate the finding of the exact commencement (and end) of a Jupiter's year which may be mentioned in a Hindu date, I have constructed[1] the accompanying Tables from the *data* in my paper on the Sixty-Year Cycle, *ante*, pp. 193-209. Tables 1 and 2 serve for the Sûrya-Siddhânta rule; Tables 3 and 4 for the Jyôtistattva rule.

In Table 1 the last two columns give the day of the Julian period for the commencement (or end) of a complete cycle of sixty years, counted from Vijaya as the first year of the cycle, without and with Bîja; and the first column gives the European date for the day put down in the same line under the heading 'without Bîja,' while the second and third columns give the expired (northern) Vikrama and Śaka years to which that European date belongs. Table 2, on the other hand, gives the number of days for the commencement of every year within the sixty-year cycle, also without and with Bîja. And all that is necessary to find the European date for the commencement of any year, is, to add up one set of figures from Table 1 and another set of figures from Table 2, and to convert the sum into the European date, and into hours and minutes after mean sunrise (for Ujjain), as may be seen from the following example:—

According to *Archæol. Survey of India*, Vol. XI. Plate xxxvii. 3, a stone inscription at Jaunpur is dated—

Jyê(jyai)shthê mâsê sitê pakshê dvâdasyâ(śyâ)-m=Budha-vâsarê . . . . Plava-vatsarê || Saṁvat 1353 ||, —

corresponding to Wednesday, 16th May, A.D. 1296. The cycle of sixty years, of which the year Plava, which is here coupled with the Vikrama year 1353, forms part, must be the one which by Table 1 commenced in Vikrama 1344 expired; and we accordingly have, for the commencement of this year Plava, without Bîja, —

by Table 1, commencement of cycle, without Bîja, for V. 1344, ...	2191	424	3914
+ by Table 2, commencement of Plava, without Bîja, ...	2	888	2138
sum	2194	312	6052

i.e., the 13th September, A.D. 1295, 14 h 31·5 m. after mean sunrise; and similarly, for the commencement of Plava, with Bîja,—

by Table 1, ...	2191	459	6007
+ by Table 2, ...	2	888	2772
sum	2194	347	8779.

i.e., the 18th October, A.D. 1295, 21 h. 4.2 m. after mean sunrise.

Having found the commencement of a year, we find the end of the same year by adding to the sum found, for the year without Bîja 361·0267 days, and for the year with Bîja 361·0347 days, as shown in my former article, thus:—

Commencement of Plava, without Bîja, ...	2194	312	6052
+		361	0267
sum.	2194	673	6319

i.e., the 8th September, A.D. 1269, 15 h. 9·9 m. after mean sunrise, — end of Plava without Bîja; and

Commencement of Plava, with Bîja, ...	2194	347	8779
+		361	0347
sum . . .	2194	708	9126

i.e., the 13th October, A.D. 1296, 21 h. 54·1 m. after mean sunrise, — end of Plava, with Bîja.

To show how to find by the Tables the Jupiter's year current at any given moment, and, at the same time, to test once more the accuracy of the Tables, we will ask —What year, without Bîja, was current, and what portion of that year had elapsed, at the time of the Mêsha-Saṁkrânti of the expired Śaka year 1713?

By the Tables given in my paper on the Sixty-Year Cycle, the day of the Julian period for the commencement of the solar year Śaka 1713 expired, = Kaliyuga 4892 expired, is—

2375 309·4392 (Mêsha-Saṁkrânti).

Deduct next lower complete cycle, without Bîja, in Table 1, ...	2364	717	2175
remainder . .	10	592·2217;	
deduct next lower figure, without Bîja, in Table 2, . .	10	469·7749	(commencement of Dundubhi).
remainder		122	4468.

Accordingly, by the Tables, the year without Bîja, current at the time of the Mêsha-Saṁkrânti of Śaka 1713 expired, was Dundubhi, and of this year there had elapsed, at the same moment, 122·4468 days = 122 days, 10 h. 43 4 m. of solar time. Now, by a MS. calendar for Śaka 1713 expired, which is in the Royal Library at Berlin, the Jupiter's year current at the commencement of the year *was* Dundubhi, as found above; and

[1] The construction of these Tables has to some extent been suggested to me by the general practice of Dr Schram's *Hilfstafeln für Chronologie*, and by some MS. Tables for the Sûrya-Siddhânta rule, without Bîja, constructed on similar principles, though without reference to the Julian period, by Mr. Sh. B. Dîkshit.